

THE WORLD AS POWER  
POWER AS MIND

E5

SIR JOHN WOODROFFE



hisewapilla

31. 8. 23.

E5



THE WORLD AS POWER  
POWER AS MIND

**BY THE SAME AUTHOR**

**THE WORLD AS POWER**

**Reality**

**Power as Life (Prāna-Shakti)**

**Power as Matter (Bhūta-Shakti)**

*(In the Press)*

**Power as Consciousness (Chit-Shakti)**

*(In Preparation)*

**also**

**Shakti and Shakta (2nd Ed.)**

**Is India Civilized (3rd Ed.)**

**Seed of Race (2nd Ed.)**

**Bharata Shakti (3rd Ed.)**

# THE WORLD AS POWER POWER AS MIND

BY

SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

PUBLISHERS :  
GANESH & CO., MADRAS

1922



## FOREWORD

REFERENCE is made in the Text to some similarities and differences between European philosophical systems and the Vedānta. It may prove convenient however to summarise here some recent tendencies in Western Psychology and their bearing upon Indian Doctrines on the same subject.

The fundamental peculiarity of the Advaita Vedānta, and therefore of its Shākta form, is the distinction which it draws between Mind and Consciousness in the sense of *Chit*; a word for which there is no exact equivalent in any European Language. I propose to deal with this term in a future volume but will meanwhile describe it "as the Unchanging Principle of all Experience, and which is the common source and basis of both Mind and Matter. *Chit* is the infinite Whole (*Pūrṇa*) in which all that is finite, whether as Mind or Matter, is. This is the Supreme Infinite Experience, free of all finitization which is

Pure Spirit as distinguished from Mind and Body. Finite experience is that which is had through Mind and Body, which are the products of the finitizing principle of *Chit* which is called Supreme Power or *Mahāshakti*. Because of this the World is Power, being the manifestation as Mind and Matter of the Power which is the dynamic aspect of the Fundamental Reality or *Chit* as *Shakti*, or Supreme Consciousness-Power. Power being the principle of negation or finitization of Consciousness, its product or manifestation as Mind and Matter is unconscious (*Jada*) for in so far and to the extent that any thing is not Pure Consciousness (in the sense of *Chit*) it is unconsciousness or *Achit*. It is because Mind is a manifestation of a principle of unconsciousness that the Whole (*Pūrna*) which is without section (*Akhanda*) or a continuum as the Ether of Consciousness (*Chidākāsha*) is experienced by the individual centre or *Jīva* as the not-whole (*Aपūrṇa*) and as a section (*Khanda*). This is pragmatic or conventional (*Vyavahārika*) experience as contrasted with the transcendental (*Paramārthika*) experience or Experience-Whole.

The existence of a supreme unitary experience is not a matter with which Western psychology is concerned, though in metaphysics there have been Monistic Systems. According to Vedānta however the question whether *Chit* is a fact or not, is not a subject of speculation only but a matter of actual experience as the *Samādhi* of perfected *Yoga*.

I may note however here some tendencies or conclusions which favour the Vedāntic view.

As the reduction of Matter to *quasi-material* Ether and that of Energy to Stress in Ether is going on in Science, we notice a marked tendency in psychology (as in Herbert Spencer, Wundt, Ladd, etc.), to regard the common basis of Mind and Matter (psychosis and neurosis) as spiritual rather than material.

As above stated, the common basis in Indian doctrine (by which I mean that here dealt with) is spiritual, that is *Chit*, the Ether of Consciousness (*Chidākāsha*) from which Mind and Matter issue and in which they are. "Ether of Consciousness" (*Chidākāsha*) does not of course mean that *Chit* is Ether but that *Chit* is, like the physical Ether, in being an

all pervading Continuum in which all things are and which penetrates all things. In Vedānta, Mind and Matter spring from one source (*Chit*) and exist in parallelism, the one having the same reality as and being the co-essential of the other.

It is now commonly held that there is both an Unconscious and Conscious Mind. The first is described by Freud as consisting of all that realm of the Ego which is unknown and cannot be spontaneously recalled by the subject and which is made manifest, and then often in a disguised form only, in special psychic conditions such as dreams and trances and can be evoked only by special methods. It is now recognised that a large part of our psychic life remains and operates in the Unconscious so that we are perforce unaware of it. Conscious Mind consists of that part of our psychic life of which we are aware. Unconscious and Conscious Mind are but two aspects of the one Entity the Psyche. It has been said (Bow "Psycho-analysis") that the term "unconscious" is open to certain objections. Since we can only be aware of anything by means of Consciousness nothing that

we are aware of can be in any realm but that of the Conscious: hence the term “Unconscious Mind” becomes meaningless. That is so on this theory, but not in Vedānta to which it makes some approximation. This approximation consists in the admission that Mind can be unconscious though it is added that it is also in another aspect conscious. The Vedānta and Sāṅkhya say that Mind, as such, is always an unconscious force and operation. It derives its appearance of being conscious because of its association with the Conscious Principle or *Chit*. It finitizes *Chit* for the individual consciousness. What is called in the West “unconscious mind” is that state in which Mind ever associated with Consciousness, is yet not in the field of awareness owing to the density of the veiling principle of *Tamas*. In this realm of the Western Unconscious Mind are all the *Sangskāras* or tendencies acquired in the course of the life-history of the individual of which he becomes aware if and when the density of the veil is lessened.

According to Sāṅkhya-yoga a *Sangskāra* is a sub-conscious or subliminal (*Sūkshmarūpa*)

continuation of what was once a conscious activity (*Vyapāra*) whether cognitive, affective or conative. A conscious activity when gone through does not absolutely end there: It simply passes into a potential and hidden (*Avyakta* and *Sūkshma*) condition below the threshold of consciousness. It goes on *ad infinitum* more and more below the level of the ordinary consciousness. This for pragmatic reasons lights up only between certain limits. Stimuli and brain excitements of certain degrees of intensity only evoke response. But the activities do not leave when pragmatic consciousness fails to notice them. They go on.

Thus the course of any activity (*Vyapāra*) in mental life displays itself when above the threshold of consciousness as conscious activity and when it sinks below the threshold it is called a *Sangskāra* or tendency or potential due to unconscious mental operations. But each term, whether tendency or potential, implies *Pratibandhaka* or constraint for why should it be tendency or potential only unless some influence keeps it down? It requires to be released from restraint

to come up again which release takes place through a stimulus (*Udbodhaka, Vyanjaka*). If mental activity be regarded as a form of *Parispanda* or vibration in the Mind-stuff, the motion does not cease when it becomes hidden (*Avyakta*) to consciousness. It still continues, though not with sufficient intensity to evoke conscious response. It is easily understandable that the more recent the impression may be, the easier is its recall. Some forms of Western Psychology at any rate now recognise that Mind may be unconscious. It will gain further consistency by regarding all mental operation as unconscious, deriving its apparent consciousness from association with the Spiritual Principle which is the one and only Illuminator. Though psycho-physical parallelism (*i.e.*, between psychosis and neurosis) is maintained, the tendency is less to-day to regard consciousness as merely a function of the brain. Hence, many now think that there is a consciousness wider and deeper than cerebral consciousness. Thus the possibility of "ejective" consciousness, disembodied consciousness, etc., is beginning to be recognised by many.

The present tendency is to regard the “sub-liminal consciousness” as constituting the most important and active part of our mental life. Thus the “threshold of consciousness” is only a pragmatic limit and not an absolute boundary of consciousness. According to Vedānta Consciousness *per se*, that is in the sense of *Chit* is boundless. The individual is a centre in that boundlessness whose limits are determined by the combination of Mind and Matter which constitutes it as such individual. The individual again is aware of certain mental functioning in himself and the greater portion at any moment exists as *Sangskāras* not present to consciousness.

Again the continuity of Animal Mind and Human Mind (in point of development), and the possibility of the latter's further development into Super-consciousness are now recognised. In fact, the relations of normal, abnormal and subnormal mental lives are now more correctly understood. The study of these different species of Mind (genius, lunacy, childhood, criminality, hypnosis, trance, etc.,) is perhaps leading to the recognition of a Generic Mind (Hiranyagarbha) which is in

different modes of manifestation. Using Consciousness in its popular sense there is sub-consciousness, consciousness and superconsciousness or Yoga consciousness. Super-mind is Brahman. Further Mind can no longer be treated in watertight compartments.

The “atomistic” view of sensations, etc., which go to make up complex perceptions, etc., is now discarded. Mental life is now recognised as a *continuum*. The distinct perceptions, ideas, etc., are only the pragmatic “fact-sections” of the undivided whole of experience. (W. James, Ward and others.)

Psychology again, on the whole, demonstrates the unity and continuity of all mental life. Psychic life is a continuity in the sense that at any given moment it is determined by all that has previously happened and is happening. This is well established Indian Doctrine. The whole doctrine of *Karma* and *Sangskāra* is based on this continuity. Mental Life is again one. Thus “Faculties” cannot now be treated as quite separate. Instinct, Intelligence, Reason, etc., are now treated from a more organic point of view. The departmental view of Mind is out of date. The

division into “faculties” has a practical use as had in the Indian system the classification of the *Tattvas* which constitute the *Antahkarana*. But though the working of Mind shows various aspects the *Antahkarana* is at base one.

The Cartesian dualism of Mind and Matter (with no possibility of interaction) is commonly discarded in Modern Psychology which tends more and more to regard them not as merely “parallel aspects” but as co-essentials. I have dealt with the subject of inter-action in the Text. The Cartesian position which denied to the finite Mind any effective control over Matter, and which was developed by many nineteenth century physiologists into this position, namely that Man is an “automanon” (Huxley) his consciousness and will having no real control over his brain and nervous system, but only recording and registering what may be going on in the brain, etc., as the result of physico-chemical changes—this position, is now being steadily given up. The Causal efficacy of consciousness is now recognised as in Vedānta. The distinction of Primary and Secondary qualities in

sense-perception is disappearing. Either all of them are actually in the Thing or none of them are actually in the Thing. One of the latest developments (*viz.*, Neo-Realism) tends to place all of them in the Thing, as the Vedānta does. This subject I have developed in an earlier volume of this series ("Reality").

The Mind at the time of birth is not a *tabula rasa*, but a store-house of tendencies and pre-dispositions. This is a common position now. This is also the Vedāntic position according to which Man is born with his inherent *Sangsāras*.

Emphasis has rightly been laid on the pragmatic view of reality. Thus Western Psychology is coming to recognise *three* orders of Reality (*a*) Transcendental, *i.e.*, what exists independent of this particular experience; (*b*) Pragmatic, *i.e.*, what is useful to us and serves a practical purpose (*Vyavahārika*) ; and (*c*) Phenomenal or Apparent.

Next, what is called "The New Psychology" in the West (cf. E. Boirac's "Psychology of the Future," and "Our Hidden Forces") is establishing Mind as a Force, capable of energising in uncommon ways, and

hence ushering in the Philosophy and Practice of so called “occult powers” and Yoga.

Lastly the fundamental Cosmic Impulse to evolutionary movement is not to-day blind physical “force,” but modern thought tends to regard it more and more as a spiritual stress. Thus the *élan vital* (Vital Impetus) of Prof. Henri Bergson is neither physical force nor vital force in the ordinary biological sense; it is something more fundamental. This Impetus is at the back of Creative Evolution.

This last Matter opens up an exposition of the whole Shākta Doctrine. According to this teaching the Universe is a Dynamism—an expression (and therefore necessarily finite) of Shakti and an infinite reservoir of Power or Shakti. It is Auto-dynamic as such expression of Power. The ultimate Reality has two aspects—one static (*Chit*) and the other Kinetic or *Shakti* which is both *Chit Shakti* that is efficient cause as Supreme Will and *Māyā Shakti* or instrumental and material (*Upadāna*) Cause. Before the manifestation of the Universe, *Chit* and its Power or Shakti were as one. Power was the mere potency of a future Universe. This general potency, or tendency

holds within itself all the particular tendencies or *Sangskāras* which are both the product and the producers of *Karma*. The impulse to manifestation is the display of Supreme Will which arises on the “ripening” of those tendencies towards manifestation. The Ultimate Reality which is Pure Consciousness or Spirit—thus vests itself from out its Power with a psychical and a physical body which is the Universe consisting of the totality of the individual Minds and Bodies in which the Source of all Power is immanent. The whole machinery of *Prakriti* in the *Sāṅkhya* is automatic and *Shakti* is self-acting both as to the original creative impulse as also as regards all in which this impulse manifests.

*Calcutta*

J. W.

20th July, 1922



# THE WORLD AS POWER

## POWER AS MIND

(MĀNASĪ SHAKTI)

### § 1

THIS subject resolves itself into a consideration of the nature of "Mind" as contrasted with Matter and their relation to one another.

The fundamental difference between Western and Eastern Psychology is that the former *does not*, and the latter<sup>1</sup> *does differentiate Mind from Consciousness*. On the contrary Western psychology interprets Mind in terms of

---

<sup>1</sup> In Sāṅkhya and Vedānta. It is the unchanging principle of all experience in mind and body which are its modes. Nyāyā-Vaisheshika, though distinguishing Manas as the instrument and Ātmā as the substratum of Consciousness, does not recognise Pure Consciousness as Chit. Even the consciousness of its Ishvara is not pure (Shuddha) in the sense of being Nirvishesha. It is Savishesha, with infinitely rich content.

Consciousness, that is Consciousness is the distinctive character of Mind. Where Mind and Consciousness are used as equivalents the one of the other, ordinary experience is of course meant and not pure *Chit* or supreme unconditioned Consciousness.

The Western "Mind" is something for which there is no adequate Sanskrit equivalent since the notions are different. When I speak of Mind in Vedānta I refer to what is explained later as the "Inner Instrument" (*Antahkarana*) as distinguished from the "outer instruments" (*Bāhyakarana*) or senses on the one hand, and on the other hand from Consciousness of which both mind and senses are instruments.

The term Mind bears a narrower as well as wider meaning in the *Shāstras*. Thus in the saying "from where speech together with mind (*Manas*) withdraws failing to reach" (referring to the Brahman) the word *Manas* (mind) is evidently used for the whole "Inner Instrument". In strictly philosophical literature however, the term *Manas* is almost always used in a defined sense so that it cannot be translated into "Mind" as understood by Western psychologists. It is only then one function of

the inner instrument. Indian "Mind"<sup>2</sup> is distinguished from Western Mind in this that the former as such is not Consciousness but a material force enveloping Consciousness, the two in association producing the Consciousness-unconsciousness of Western Mind. Pure Consciousness (*Chit*) is not an attribute of Mind. It is beyond Mind being independent of it. It is immanent in Mind and is the source of its illumination and apparent Consciousness.<sup>3</sup>

In the older Western schools "Consciousness" was used in the more limited and personal sense of the mind's direct cognisance of its own states and processes; the perception of what passes in a man's own mind. But it was later and is now used in a wider sense and the question is now raised whether Consciousness is co-extensive with mind. In

<sup>2</sup> Western "Mind" is the Indian Antahkaranā-vachchhinna Chaitanya, i.e., Chit (Consciousness) as (apparently) conditioned by Antahkarana which as Jada or unconscious Process is of and in the condition, viz., Antahkarana and not in that which seems to be conditioned, viz., Chit. Manas which is sometimes translated 'Mind' is only part of Antahkarana.

<sup>3</sup> that is in Sāṅkhya and Vedānta.

this wider sense it is used,<sup>4</sup> in general anti-thesis to Matter, to cover that phase of reality which does not permit of exclusive interpretation in terms of matter in motion, but allows or requires the hypothesis of something analogous to conscious process. It is further said that there may be even unconscious mental modification, in which case Consciousness is not co-extensive with mind. Here we have something either intelligence, feeling, or will, not in personal individual consciousness, without which however the flow of consciousness would not be what it is. The recognition by present-day psychologists of two forms of mental life, conscious and sub-conscious (sub-liminal) seems to contain the germs of the distinction, which India has always held, between Mind and Consciousness. This belief in two forms of mental life—conscious and sub-conscious (sub-liminal) is held by many psychologists.

This view is in consonance with Vedānta which calls the latent and sub-conscious a *Sangskara* and adds a third, viz., Super-consciousness that is beyond ordinary

<sup>4</sup> Baldwin Dict., *Sub-voc.*, Mind.

consciousness, whether latent or patent, which is pure *Chit*. In this view ordinary consciousness is latent or patent, below or above the threshold of ordinary experience, and pure Consciousness or *Chit*, though immanent, transcends both as the Supreme Experience (*Samvid*) in which the other two are held. As between Consciousness and Mind, Western psychology regards what Vedānta calls a condition<sup>5</sup> that is mind,<sup>6</sup> as the more essential part, inasmuch as it holds that Consciousness may not be an inseparable property of the mind, many functions of which may lie in unconsciousness. Mind<sup>6</sup> is thus that of which consciousness is a separable condition—the opposite of the Vedāntik view according to which Consciousness is that of which Mind is a separable condition. Consciousness is *Chit*. It is more or less *veiled* by Mind to which whatever unconsciousness (in whatever degree) there is, is due. To use one of the expressive metaphors of the Vedānta, *Chit* is like a lamp which the Mind envelops as a screen,

---

<sup>5</sup> Upādhi that is something imposed on consciousness.

<sup>6</sup> Antahkarana.

sometimes revealing it by its transparency, sometimes concealing it by its opaqueness, and thus always conditioning its illumination both as regards its quality and quantity.

According to many Western psychologists, who in this follow or approximate to Buddhist theory, "Mind" means conscious process, that is the changing series of impressions (sensations) and ideas, a continuous flow or stream. Of what? We may leave the question unanswered, either because it assumes what is denied, or what at least is supposed to be unknown, or we may answer with the older schools that there is a simple mental substance or Soul which experiences in us—thinks, feels and wills and underlies all the varied modes of Experience. It is thus that which exists as a permanent unity behind the phenomena of mind or its processes. From the other and materialist standpoint a "Mind-stuff" and "Mind-dust" is postulated. In either case Consciousness is a function and attribute of Soul or Mind-stuff, the fundamental distinction between Consciousness and Mind not being recognised. J. S. Mill's view that mind is the permanent possibility of experience

may be said to vaguely hint at a transcendent-al principle. According to the Vedānta, that principle is Pure Chit of which both mind and matter are limited *modes* of Its Power. All psychical functions therefore, whether as intellect, feeling, will and the like are limited modes. *Chit* is pure Consciousness Itself. Mind is a real or apparent negation or limitation or determination of that. Mind in fact, in itself, that is considered as apart from Chit (from which in fact it is never separate) is an *unconscious force* which in varying degree obscures and limits consciousness, such limitation being the condition of all finite experience. *Chit* is thus Consciousness. Mind is Consciousness *plus* Unconsciousness, the intermingled Consciousness-unconsciousness which we see in all finite being. Mind is both substance and process. It is substance as the mind-substance or Antahkarana, and it is process as the modifications or *Vritti* of that substance. The process takes place in and of Mind. It is not a process of Consciousness. The substance again of both Mind and Matter is *Chit*, the Supreme Consciousness and Pure Experience Itself. Mental process is a veiling or (relative)

unveiling of Chit which is itself unchanged. Consciousness appears however to undergo change because of the modifications of mind of which it is the changeless *substratum*.

## § 2

It will be convenient here to discuss in greater detail the nature of *Shakti* or Power as Mind before dealing with the question of their relation to, and interaction upon, one another.

The European and Indian theories of the relation between, or interaction of, Mind and Matter may be thus summarised.

We may take first the dualistic theories. The Vedānta agrees with the Cause Theory in so far as the latter holds that conscious process and nervous process are causally related, provided we substitute for the word 'conscious' the word 'mental'. The process is not in Consciousness but in Mind.<sup>7</sup> The mental is a subtle quasi-material<sup>8</sup> process. It holds that

---

<sup>7</sup> Process is of and in the condition, namely, Antahkarana and not in that which seems to be conditioned or Chit.

<sup>8</sup> Bhautika. It is difficult to find a rendering of this. "Material" is used only in the negative sense as denoting something which is not wholly immaterial, which is Chit or Spirit alone.

both processes, psychical and material, have a common ground in Consciousness and thus escapes the difficulty in conceiving interaction between things of a wholly different nature as Mind and Body are commonly supposed to be. It differs therefore from psycho-physical parallelism in that the latter offers no explanation of the relation between psychosis and neurosis. It asserts, as stated, not a mere concomitance, the nature of which is unexplained, but a causal interaction between Mind and Matter rendered possible by their common ground. It differs again from any system of Pre-established Harmony in that there is not merely synchronistic change, but an action by Matter on Mind and by Mind on Matter which is possible for the reason stated. It therefore also differs from any theory of Occasionalism according to which no influence passes from one to the other, but on occasion God intervenes when the one changes to bring about change in the other. In this connection however it may be noted that Malebranche's theory that "we see all things in God" seems to adumbrate Indian doctrine which says that the Mind is enabled to perceive Matter because both are

forms of Supreme Power (Mahāshakti) which is an attribute of the Supreme Consciousness.

Turning then to Monistic Western theories —these hold that Mind and Matter are parallel manifestations of one underlying Substance. They are not two substances in interaction, but this interaction is the outer form of the inner ideal unity of consciousness. Each particle of matter has a mental aspect. “It is as if the same thing were said in two languages.” Western science thus vaguely feels that there ought to be a unity behind mind and matter but does not yet *know* where that unity has to be found, and so uses metaphors and language which from the Vedāntic standpoint appear vague. From this standpoint we must first clearly distinguish between worldly experience and Yoga-experience. According to the former there is in fact duality. We cannot escape that. From this dualistic standpoint there must be an interaction because if we assume two things we must assume an interaction between them unless we put the problem aside. Yoga-experience transcends this duality, as Pure Consciousness, for which however we have no warrant short of experience of this

state. Relatively there is the duality of Mind and Matter and their interaction. In the state beyond relations there is Pure Consciousness. In the mixed and graded Consciousness-unconsciousness which constitutes world-experience it is Consciousness (which, as above described, is 'the underlying substance' of which mind and matter are manifestations) which perceives according to the nature and workings of the unconscious Mind and Matter in which it manifests. Consciousness is the ground of Knower, Knowing and Known. The Double Aspect theory endeavours to avoid inconsequence by referring both series conjointly to the causation of a single substance.

But here again we must distinguish. Pure Consciousness<sup>9</sup> as such is neither efficient nor material cause but Consciousness-Power is both.<sup>10</sup> The former as pure *Chit* or Indian Consciousness is the changeless and processless background of all changes and processes. Though not itself changing

---

<sup>9</sup> Chit, Jnāna-svarūpa, Chidākasha, Samvid, etc., the Shiva or Prakāsha as opposed to the Shakti or Vimarsha aspect.

<sup>10</sup> As Chit-Shakti the efficient (Nimitta) and as Mayā-shakti the material (Upādāna) cause.

it contains the ground<sup>11</sup> and possibility of all change. This alogical position is expressed in Shākta doctrine by saying that in one aspect It remains what It is, yet in another It is changing to become the world. This is the Power or *Shakti* or *Vimarsha* aspect. The first is the Being, the second the Becoming aspect. Therefore in world-experience, Indian Consciousness is the unchanging Principle of all changing experience. Through its power it appears as Mind and Matter. It is against this static background that all changes occur. Activity is in Mind and Matter, now veiling now revealing unchanging *Chit* by their material processes as Psychosis or Neurosis. It is simpler, as stated later, to ignore these divisions and to say that Consciousness is the static aspect of Power (*Chit-shakti*), the kinetic aspect of which (*Māyā-shakti*) produces Mind and Matter, both in differing degrees being veilings by Unconsciousness of Consciousness.

According to Pan-psychism all matter has a rudimentary life, and mind and matter has thus a psychical aspect. This is so. But in

---

<sup>11</sup> *Adishthāna*.

what sense? In so far as anything or process is or can be an *object* of consciousness<sup>12</sup> it is *Jada* or non-conscious. The term has a psychological basis. Thus an object of consciousness may be either objective or subjective. What Western science calls Matter or quasi-material is an instance of the former. But the "inner instrument"<sup>13</sup> or Mind (including the Self) can be an object of Consciousness and is therefore as such *Jada*. In fact even Prakriti-shakti as the Causal Stress which evolves the world is from this standpoint *Jada*. Pure consciousness or *Chit* beyond mind, though manifesting in the operations of the latter, is in its transcendental aspect alogical. Thus the first polarity which appears in Consciousness is that of the Knower and Known.<sup>14</sup> When this polarity appears, *Chit* splits up as it were into two parts or poles—one part still remaining *Chit* (i.e., Knower) the other appearing as though it were not-*chit*<sup>15</sup> or *Jada* that is as the

<sup>12</sup> *Jneya* (object known) as opposed to *Jnātā* the Knower.

<sup>13</sup> *Antahkarana*.

<sup>14</sup> *Jnātā*, *Jneya*, knowing being *Jnāna*.

<sup>15</sup> *Achit*.

Known.<sup>16</sup> In the latter, *Chit* as it is in itself<sup>17</sup> is veiled. The veiling principle which is Power or Shakti is manifested as the various tendencies<sup>18</sup> of the material Cause<sup>19</sup> in various combinations. When Chit is enveloped by the material Principle<sup>20</sup> in what is mainly its revealing tendency,<sup>21</sup> we have the Inner Instrument<sup>22</sup> which corresponds to the Western Mind *minus* Consciousness. When it is enveloped by the material principle<sup>23</sup> in what is mainly its activity-tendency<sup>24</sup> we have Life;<sup>25</sup> when it is enveloped by the material Principle<sup>26</sup> in what is mainly its veiling tendency<sup>27</sup> we have Matter in the Western

<sup>16</sup> Jneya.

<sup>17</sup> Chit-svarūpa.

<sup>18</sup> Guna.

<sup>19</sup> Prakriti-shakti or Māyā-shakti.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

<sup>21</sup> Sattvaguna or the Sāttvika veil.

<sup>22</sup> Antahkarana, *i.e.*, Buddhi, Ahangkāra, Chitta, Manas.

<sup>23</sup> Prakriti-shakti or Māyā-shakti.

<sup>24</sup> Rajoguna or the Rājasika veil.

<sup>25</sup> Prāna.

<sup>26</sup> Prakriti-shakti or Māyā-shakti.

<sup>27</sup> Tamoguna or Tāmasika veil.

sense.<sup>28</sup> When therefore we speak of Matter as *Jada* we do not mean that it is unconscious in the sense that it is *in itself* unconscious and without mind or life, but in the sense that it is an *object* for consciousness, something in this sense other than it is as knower. The first primary (logical) operation by which *Chit* becomes so disposed as to remain *Chit* in one part and *appear* to cease to be *Chit* in another part is *Srishti* or Becoming called "Creation,"<sup>29</sup> and that which is obtained out of *Chit*—the "Other" the *Jada*, the object—is *Bhūta* or Matter. Therefore Mind and Matter are both in the general sense *Bhūta*.<sup>30</sup> *Chit* however never really ceases to be such, not merely in the pole which is still the Knower<sup>31</sup> but also in the other pole which is veiled so as to appear as non-*Chit*.<sup>32</sup> Thus the Tantrik

<sup>28</sup> Mūrtta jadadravya.

<sup>29</sup> The term "Creation" is here avoided owing to its associations with dualistic systems as the creation of something new from nothing as opposed to development of the actual from the potential.

<sup>30</sup> Bhautika; and therefore "material" either in a gross or subtle sense. Specifically, *Bhūta*=sensible matter.

<sup>31</sup> Jnātā or Chetana.

<sup>32</sup> Achit.

rite called *Bhūtashuddhi*,<sup>33</sup> is, philosophically considered, the removing of the Veil by the realisation of the Mantra: "He I am";<sup>34</sup> that is the Universe is first identified with the "I"<sup>35</sup> and then this with the Pure Consciousness or *Chit*. It is thus the placing of the Self in the return-current.<sup>36</sup>

From the above it follows that Western Mind,<sup>37</sup> Life, and Matter are at the root one, firstly because the primary basis in all cases is *Chit* and secondly because the Veiling Principle<sup>38</sup> which works them out is composed of the same factors<sup>39</sup> in all cases though in different degrees. Matter is *Chit* heavily veiled and inert, Life is *Chit* more lightly veiled and active. Mind is still more lightly

<sup>33</sup> Literally, purification of the elements of "Earth," "Water," etc., in the body as to which see my "Shakti and Shākta," 2nd Ed., and also, my "Serpent Power".

<sup>34</sup> So'ham.

<sup>35</sup> Aham.

<sup>36</sup> And not therefore the idle and superstitious mummery which some have ignorantly supposed it to be. Before blaming-criticism is given, endeavour should first be made to understand.

<sup>37</sup> Antahkarana.

<sup>38</sup> Māyā shakti.

<sup>39</sup> The Gunas Sattva, Rajas, Tamas of Māyā-shakti.

veiled and active,<sup>40</sup> and becomes in its developed and complex processes the revealer of the Self to the self on the mental plane, whence passage is made to the Self, beyond which there is nothing.<sup>41</sup> Both the life-aspect and mind-aspect may be the subject of direct perception by special means either of science or Yoga. A block of stone is perceived by the natural eye as inert lifeless matter. To that eye neither the signs of life nor mind are revealed. Both however may (given the appropriate means) be inferred from certain recognised signs of them. When these signs are perceived, it is said that there is a living and thinking object presented to mind. The ordinary sense-organs may be insufficient to found an inference of rudiments of life or mind say in a stone. But science extending natural faculty by its delicate instruments, or Yoga by its process of Sangyama<sup>42</sup> may enable the observer to perceive that on which the

<sup>40</sup> The activity of mind is compared to mobile mercury the "Semen of Shiva".

<sup>41</sup> Purushāt na parang kinchit sā kāshthā sā parāgatih.

<sup>42</sup> Concentration (dhāranā, dhyāna, samādhi).

inference of life and mind is established. *A priori* the conclusion may be established by the ontological theory or *à posteriori* on the theory of evolution. Though at root Matter Life and Mind are one, yet as Matter and Mind they are phenomenally different. One must assume therefore in all objects the same causal interaction of their psychic and material aspects, more or less rudimentary as it may be, as we find in man's nervous processes with their corresponding psychoses.

### § 3

What then according to Indian views is the nature of Mind?

It may be defined, in the first instance negatively, as that part of our subjective life which in itself is not Consciousness, though it appears to be conscious through association with the latter. This distinction is maintained throughout the Standards. Whether there is such a state as Pure Consciousness which is Mindless is established secondarily by *Shruti* or *Veda* as authoritative proof<sup>43</sup>, or directly, by actual personal

---

<sup>43</sup> *Āpta Pramāṇa*.

experience.<sup>44</sup> This is a matter with which I will deal under the heading of Consciousness-Power (*Chit Shakti*). As Consciousness in Itself is immeasurable or Immense (the meaning of Brahman), and as man's consciousness appears to be limited, otherwise he could not have finite experience, what limits it is a Force which, as such, is different from the Consciousness it limits. In the first Standard or Nyāya-vaisheshika, Mind is an unconscious entity (*Dravya*) separate from the Self (*Ātman*) by conjunction with which and the senses, the Self has conscious experience of objects. In the second Standard or Sāṅkhya-Yoga, Mind is a Force separate from and independent of Consciousness which it apparently *finitises* : or as in the Shākta doctrine, it is a form of *Māyā*, which is one with, and not independent of, Consciousness, being a Power of Consciousness to remain what it is and yet to contract itself into being a centre of limited experience ; or it is neither the first nor the second but a form of *Māyā* which itself is an inscrutable, unexplainable mystery.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Pratyaksha as Aparokshajñāna or Sākshātkāra.

<sup>45</sup> As in Māyāvāda Vedānta.

However related to Consciousness, it is fundamentally a mystery. Taking it as a fact of which we are aware we can also analyse it into its functions and the mode of their working. These functions are fully explained in the Sāṅkhya which in this respect is the basis of Shākta doctrine. Mind is through the sense organs (*Indriya*) affected by the objects which it selects (as *Manas*), refers to itself the personal experience so enjoyed (as *Ahangkāra*) and then determines (as *Buddhi*). The one Mind does all this, but is variously named according to its various functions as separate principles or *Tattvas*. In actual experience or functioning of the *Tattvas* in the fully evolved world, the knowing process commences with the last evolved subjective principle or the senses. The object of knowledge first knocks at this gate to be introduced within and to become subject to the inner operating principles, the last of which to so operate is the determining faculty or *Buddhi*. But in the cosmic evolution of the Principles or *Tattvas* themselves, the order is reversed and the last to function in the evolved world becomes the first to appear according to

either a temporal or logical *prius*. A logical analysis of experience establishes this. The general basis of experience, to which in the functioning of the individual mind reference is made last, must necessarily in the cosmic evolution appear first. It is also clear that the evolving principles have also a more abstract significance. Thus the I-making or individualising and centre-making Principle (*Ahangkāra Tattva*) in individual experience is that aspect of the mind which refers its operations to that particular individual. Whereas in the cosmic sense it is the tendency to individualisation which manifests later as the individual centre.

Though the mode of evolution is given differently in the Sāṅkhya<sup>46</sup> and Māyāvada Vedānta<sup>47</sup>

<sup>46</sup> The order of evolution is Prakriti, Mahat or Buddhi, Ahangkara. Then co-ordinately Manas and Indriyas (10) and their subtle objects (5) Tanmātra, and from the latter the five forms of gross sensible matter (Bhūta). These with the Purusha make 25 Tattvas.

<sup>47</sup> The evolution is from the Apanchikrita or unmixed Tanmātras or subtle matter: from the Sāttvik part of these, the Tattvas Buddhi, Manas and the five intellectual sense-organs; from the Rājasik part the five Pranas and the five active organs; from the Tāmasik part, gross sensible matter.

and there are other differences,<sup>48</sup> the description of the faculties generally holds good in Māyāvāda Vedānta. Though Shaivas and Shāktas accept the twenty-five Tattvas of Sāṅkhya they add eleven others preceding Purusha and Prakriti, the whole being known as the Thirty-six Tattvas, which are higher forms of Consciousness evolving for the production of Purusha-Prakriti and will be dealt with under the title Power as Consciousness (*Chit-Shakti*). The Mind (as *Antahkarana* or the Yoga-darshana *Chitta*) is neither all-pervasive<sup>49</sup> nor atomic and partless<sup>50</sup>. It is not therefore eternal<sup>51</sup>, has a beginning<sup>52</sup>, and has a limited extension,<sup>53</sup> that is, it is a thing of finite dimensions. It is radiant, transparent,

<sup>48</sup> e.g., Memory (*Chitta*) is a separate faculty in Vedānta and is included in Buddhi by the Sāṅkhya. The *Chitta* of the Yoga Philosophy = *Antahkarana* of Sāṅkhya and Vedānta. *Prāna* (Life) is a separate Tattva in Vedānta but not in Sāṅkhya.

<sup>49</sup> *Vibhu-parimāṇa*.

<sup>50</sup> *Anu-parimāṇa*. It is therefore *Madhyama parimāṇa*.

<sup>51</sup> *Nitya*.

<sup>52</sup> *Sādi*.

<sup>53</sup> *Sāvayava, parichchhinna*.

light<sup>54</sup>, like the Solar rays<sup>55</sup>, light and mobile<sup>56</sup>. It is a kind of " Radiant Matter ".<sup>57</sup> In Vedānta it is called *Bhautika* because it is a mode of the unmixed *Bhūtas*<sup>58</sup> from varying aspects of which are derived according to the Māyā Vedānta both Matter and Mind. Therefore these two are essentially similar<sup>59</sup>. Mind (Antahkarana) is not rigid that is having the same configuration always, but elastic<sup>60</sup>. *It actually goes out like a ray* (though not in the act of knowledge altogether leaving the body) to the object of perception,

<sup>54</sup> Taijasa, having a predominance of Sattva-guna or the revealing aspect of Substance-Energy, the aspect in which it reveals consciousness.

<sup>55</sup> Ravi-kirana-vat.

<sup>56</sup> Laghu and Chara.

<sup>57</sup> To use the term of Sir W. Crookes, applied by him to matter in the fourth state.

<sup>58</sup> Apanchikrita or Sūkshma Bhūta. It is derived from their Sāttvika or revealing aspect, as Matter is derived from their veiling or Tāmasika aspect. According to the Sāṅkhyan scheme, adopted by Shaktivāda, both the senses and subtle objects (Tanmātra) derive from a common source (Ahankara) or self-arrogating and individualising principle.

<sup>59</sup> See last note. The Chhāndogya Up. says that the lowest units (anishta angsha) of the food (anna) eaten go to build up the " body " of the mind.

<sup>60</sup> Sangkocha-vikāsha-shila.

envelops it, and *takes its form*. Some may call this materialism, but the Vedānta holds not that mind is derived from matter in the physical sense but that they are fundamentally and essentially one, that is Pure Consciousness (Chit) stressing or energising one way or the other. They are different modes of the one Power (Shakti) as Substance-Energy.<sup>61</sup>

#### § 4

We may now consider in greater detail the nature of Mind, its functions and their process. According to the pluralistic first Standard or Nyāya-vaisheshika, the Ātman or Self is all pervading, immense,<sup>62</sup> the ground,<sup>63</sup> and agent<sup>64</sup> of knowledge. It is thus the seat of consciousness. Beyond this we cannot say. It has the attribute of consciousness when conjoined with *Manas* or “Mind,” which is something quite different from it. It is an

<sup>61</sup> The Maya-shakti of Advaita-vedānta and Shaktivāda corresponding to the Mūla-prakṛiti of the Sāṅkhya.

<sup>62</sup> Vibhu.

<sup>63</sup> Āshraya or Adhishthāna.

<sup>64</sup> Karttā.

atomic<sup>65</sup> or infinitesimal, unconscious instrument<sup>66</sup> of knowledge. The Self, working with it, is conscious. It is the means whereby perception becomes possible and may thus be called the Inner Sense.<sup>67</sup> It works in co-operation with the outer senses which are made of the same material as the objects which are sensed. Like is known by like. The atomic character of *Manas* is inferred from the fact that perceptions or experiences arise serially and not simultaneously. Sensations are thus experienced, though several objects may be presented simultaneously to several sense organs. If *Manas* were all pervading it would be always in contact with the different sense organs, and through them, with the various objects, so that it might attend to and admit all these objects at once. But experience shows (it is said) that it does not. On the contrary it acts like a turnpike gate through which only one sensation at a time can enter. It has been aptly compared<sup>68</sup> to a

---

<sup>65</sup> Anu.

<sup>66</sup> Karana.

<sup>67</sup> Antarindriya.

<sup>68</sup> In the Commentary to *Shatchakra-nirupana*. See my "Serpent Power".

door-keeper, who admits one person at a time and keeps others out. It is thus conceived as concentrated into a point. It is true that one may seem to have a number of different sensations (induced by different sense organs) at once but there is here (it is said) only an appearance of simultaneous activity. *Manas* is not only very small but exceedingly light<sup>69</sup> so that it can pass very quickly from object to object, so quickly indeed that its successive attention and apprehension appear as a simultaneous activity.<sup>70</sup> It may be objected: May we not explain both serial and simultaneous apprehension by conceiving *Manas* as a substance with parts which may be contracted and expanded? In such case when several sensations are to be apprehended at once, the *Manas* expands and thus puts itself simultaneously into connection with several sense organs. When however one at a time has to be received, it contracts itself into a point and connects with only one sense organ. In such case we need not assume any mistake. This suggestion of an

<sup>69</sup> *Atilāghavat.*

<sup>70</sup> Thus a spark of light if made to rotate rapidly in a circle appears as a continuous circle of light.

elastic mind is rejected on the ground that it gratuitously assumes a substance with many parts which increase in expansion and decrease in contraction. It is in the Nyāya-Vaisheshika partless and unextended.<sup>71</sup> This partlessness is inferred from the seriality<sup>72</sup> of attention and apprehension.

The process of perception is in a general way as follows: It is either internal<sup>73</sup> or external.<sup>74</sup> In external perception<sup>75</sup> these connections must be successively established—(1) the contact of the object with the appropriate sense organ,<sup>76</sup> (2) the Manas or the inner organ of apprehension must attend, and (3) offer the sensations to the self or Ātman.

Because of its atomicity (*Anutva*) *Manas* can attend to only one at a time, but it can attend quickly in succession because of its lightness. As a gate in action, it introduces the sensations one by one to the Self to be known,

<sup>71</sup> *Anurūpa*.

<sup>72</sup> *Ayaugapadyat*.

<sup>73</sup> e.g., "I am happy" *Aham sukhi*.

<sup>74</sup> e.g., Ayang ghatah "here is the jar".

<sup>75</sup> *Vāhya-vishaya-pratyaksha*.

<sup>76</sup> *Indriyārtha-sannikarsha*.

felt, and owned by the latter. *Manas* is itself unconscious,<sup>77</sup> partless,<sup>78</sup> atomic<sup>79</sup> and hence eternal<sup>80</sup> and unchanging. It simply plays the part of the Usherer, either admitting or refusing. It is instrumental in the production of knowledge but is neither its ground<sup>81</sup> nor agent.<sup>82</sup> Without the third step or offer of the sensation to the Self there is no knowing, and in particular no referring, of an experience to the Self—apperception as Western Psychology sometimes calls it.

The Self according to this system is possessed of fourteen attributes<sup>83</sup> of which Cognition (*Buddhi*),<sup>84</sup> Feeling (*Sukhaduhkha*; agreeable and disagreeable) and Will (*Ichchhā*) are counted first.<sup>85</sup> The Self has three kinds of

<sup>77</sup> Achetana.

<sup>78</sup> Niravayava.

<sup>79</sup> Anu.

<sup>80</sup> Nitya.

<sup>81</sup> Adhishthana.

<sup>82</sup> Adyaksha.

<sup>83</sup> Guna.

<sup>84</sup> from *Budh*=to know.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. G. F. Stout : Classification of experience into cognition, interest, and the latter into feeling-attitude and volition.

activity as knowledge, will, and action.<sup>86</sup> Cognition is divided into experience (*Anubhuti*) and representation or recollection (*Smṛiti*) : and the former into direct perception, inference, analogy, knowledge due to authentic testimony.<sup>87</sup> This Standard is distinguished by the multiplicity of its ultimate entities and its non-recognition of pure *Chit* as the essential nature of the Ātmā. Consciousness is an attribute of the Self. A close examination of this matter reveals a greater connection with the other Standards than thus appears on the surface. For according to them also, knowledge of objects only takes place through the contact of object, senses, and *Manas* with the Ātmā. The Self in itself is called by them *Chit* but that *Chit* is wholly different from the apparently limited consciousness and is in fact indescribable by the latter or any other term.

Mental life does not consist of conscious processes alone. Many states and operations of *Antahkarana* exist and go on in sub-liminal consciousness. It is to the dynamism of the

<sup>86</sup> Jnāna-shakti, Ichchhā-shakti, Kriyā-shakti.

<sup>87</sup> Pratyaksha, Anumiti, Upamiti, Shabdaja or Expert, including Revelation.

sub-liminal or sub-conscious states and operations of *Antahkarana* that the name *Sangskāra* is given. The Western Cerebralist would explain the dynamism of memory and sub-liminal operations by cerebral modifications or cerebral motions. But cerebral modifications or motions, though they may be the physical counterparts, are not the physical bases of those states and operations, since these can exist even when the *Antahkarana* becomes dissociated from the body. Modern Spiritualists claim that disembodied Spirits can put themselves into rapport with ourselves, and thus prove that they carry recollections of the life they lived as ordinary men on earth. How can this be possible if the brain be the physical basis of memory, etc.? The *Shāstras* claim that it is possible (and modern instances of such psychic phenomena are in evidence) that one can remember, whether spontaneously or through special voluntary effort, the incidents of one's previous births (*Jātismara*). How again could this be if the brain instead of the *Lingadeha* (Subtle Body which, according to *Shāstra*, leaves the physical body at the time of death) were the basis of memory, etc.?

The dynamism of memory and sub-liminal processes in general will have therefore to be explained by the mechanism of the *Antah-karana* itself, which mechanism is called the system of *Sangskāras*. Since *Antahkarana* (Mind), *Prāna* (Life), and *Bhūta* (Matter), are co-essential with one another, the latter two have also mechanisms corresponding to *Sangskāras*. For instance, what are called Tendencies and Potential Energies of Matter may be called their *Sangskāras*.

Now, in the First Standard (Nyāya-vaiśheṣika) the *Sangskāras* inhere in the *Ātman* and not in *Manas*, which is simple and *anu*, and cannot therefore be the basis of a system of tendencies, subtle and potential energies. It also makes the *Sangskāras* destructible: though unlike the Buddhist systems it makes them *relatively* stable or persistent; Time, disease or a last recollection (*Charama-smarana*) can put an end to a *Sangskāra*. But from the dynamic standpoint of the two Higher Standards, the *Sangskāras* are Forces and as such must be persistent. From the standpoint of Sāṅkhya, a *Sangskāra* is Tendency, while a *Vritti* is Action: both are

*Vyāpāra* (energising) of Antahkarana. Between Tendency and Action, however, it recognises no distinction in *kind*; it is only a distinction of *degree* and of relation with respect to normal consciousness. That is to say, when a *Vritti* sinks below the threshold of normal consciousness and *continues* as a subliminal action, it becomes a *Sangskāra*. A *smṛiti* or representation is thus the coming up on the level of consciousness (subject of course to temporal and other conditions) of a past presentation (*vṛitti*) which has never ceased to exist. The Second Standard makes the curve of life a *continuous* line which is, in parts, above and, in parts, below the normal line of consciousness. Mental life = *Vrittis* + *sangskāras* = actual presentations + possible representations = actions + tendencies (which are *avyakta* or subtle actions). There is cyclic causation between *Vrittis* and *Sangskāras*; they cause one another. And this cycle is beginningless and endless, though at the time of the dissolution of creation or *Mukti* (liberation) the *Vrittis* and *Sangskāras* may lapse into *Prakṛiti* or *Māyā* and so cease to have any effect on the *Purusha* or *Ātman*. With

respect to the *Mukta Purusha* or *Ātman*, they are effectively non-existent, they cease to exist. Bondage means subjection (through ignorance) to the causal cycle referred to above, Liberation means disengagement from the cycle. If bondage were based on *fact* as distinguished from *Avidyā* or ignorance of fact, then there could be no possible escape from the cycle, for, in itself, the cycle can have no absolute beginning or end ; hence both Sāṅkhya and Vedānta make the association of the Self with the cycle not a fact, but an ignorance of fact,—an ignorance of what It is and what the cycle is. The moment knowledge of this comes, the cycle goes. Shaktivāda regards the *whole* as Fact that is Self and the Cycle ; the ignorance of Self of what It is and what the Cycle is ; Its knowledge ; Its bondage and Its liberation. In any case, so long at least as liberation has not come, all *Sangskāras* lie in *Antahkarana* as latent activities, not only of this birth but of all previous cycles of birth. In a given type of birth (say, human), however, only those *Sangskāras* are called into play which are appropriate to that particular type ; other kinds of *Sangskāras* lie

dormant then. Like forces, *Sangskāras* aid or inhibit one another ; as mutually aiding and inhibiting forces, they constitute what is called *Vāsanā* (from *vas* to lie or inhere)—the very Background of our conscious mental life.

### § 5

The second Standard or *Sāṅkhya-Yoga* recognises pure Consciousness or *Chit* as the *Purushas* who differ from the *Ātmans* of the last Standard, in that they are attributeless. *Purusha* is pure Being or Consciousness. He is not *Karttā* or agent. Experience is not his but another's. He simply manifests and without it there is no manifestation. With it is associated the changing Unconscious Principle of Nature or *Prakriti*—*Natura naturans* as Spinoza would have called Her. Though associated with those *Purushas* or Spirits who are not freed from Her influence, She is yet separate from and independent of them. Consciousness and Unconsciousness (as mind and matter) are two distinct Realities, for the system is dualistic. This *Prakriti* is constituted of three Factors and displays itself in three

aspects and moments, as that which reveals Consciousness (*Sattva-guna*), that which veils Consciousness (*Tamas-guna*) and as the Principle of activity which moves either to suppress the other (*Rajas-guna*). Prakriti is primordial Substance-Energy in which the factors are in a state of Equilibrium. In creation the equilibrium is disturbed by a kind of catalytic action in which the *Purusha* or Consciousness does nothing, but Nature, eternally active, commences to play as various forms before him the Seer. The forms so produced are called *Vikriti* or transformations and correspond to *Natura naturata*. Homogeneity of Substance-Energy becomes heterogeneous as various collocations of the one Substance-Energy. In the first Standard the *Sangskaras* or Tendencies inhere in the *Ātman*: in this Standard they inhere in the natural unconscious Principle or *Prakriti* and on creation are realised.

From *Prakriti*, which is an ultimate and not derivative principle, issues *Buddhi* the determining principle whether in thought or action. As a transformation of *Prakriti* there first issues the Cosmic *Buddhi* or *Mahat Tattva*.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> *Sāmyāvasthā*.

This is the stage at which Energy previously undifferentiated, assumes a definite direction<sup>89</sup> and posture<sup>90</sup> towards a defined line of evolution.<sup>91</sup> This condition of directedness is aptly expressed by the term determination (*Adhyavasāya*). Here, where we are dealing with the state of Energy prior to the appearance of the individual, it is in the nature of cosmic volition. *Mahat-Tattva* is the stage in which the tendency towards individualisation takes a direction or rather resolves (*Adhyavasāya*) to take a direction. But what direction? This is as yet implicit in *Mahat*. It is merely a determination as such to change in a particular line, the line itself being still undecided. It

<sup>89</sup> Here and post, I refer to a paper on Mind by Professor P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya. See also Prof. J. N. Das Gupta's work on *Yoga-shāstra* and as to the definition of the faculties J. C. Chattopādhyāya's *Kashmir Shaivism*. In the Shākta system a posture, attitude or aspect of Power is *Mudrā*.

<sup>90</sup> Posture of Supreme Power or *Mudrā* (in the highest sense of the word). *Mudrā* in the Tantra Shāstras such as *Trikhanda Mudrā* also belong to worship as ritual gesture and posture.

<sup>91</sup> To borrow an analogy from mathematical language a scalar quantity (having magnitude but no direction) becomes a vector quantity (having both magnitude and direction).

is a massive (hence the term *Mahat*) cosmic resolution in which the "how" and the "what" of the operation are yet implicit. In cognition too a vague and massive experience commonly precedes a definite and articulated experience. It is as if *Prakriti* says to Herself this: "I shall no longer remain as equilibrated Energy, but I will change in a definite direction: what this direction will be is seen later." *Buddhi* as this massive, inarticulate, cosmic resolution is not to be identified with the individualised will, though it is the ultimal basis of it. *Buddhi* is determination, decision<sup>92</sup> after deliberation in the nature of volition. Deliberation,<sup>93</sup> decision and volition are, from this standpoint, unconscious processes, which become conscious only by incidence thereon of the illumination of Consciousness as the *Purusha* or *Chit*. From the point of view of evolution, *Buddhi* is a state of mere presentation, consciousness of

<sup>92</sup> *Nishchayātmikā*.

<sup>93</sup> *Adhyavasāyātmikā buddhih* (*Sāṅkhya Pravachana*, II. 13). *Buddhi* is thus also called *Nishchaya-kārini*.

being only without thought of "I" (*Ahang-kāra*) and unaffected by sensations of particular objects (*Manas, Indriya*). In short abstract from mind every other of the faculties hereafter stated and you have *Buddhi* as their basis. In the individual it is implicit in everything which is derived from it and includes all intellectual and volitional functions which are not theirs. It is thus the principal Tattva. It is the Basis of all Knowing, Feeling, Willing. Its special function is "determination" which is the last in the cognitional, affectional and volitional process. We must also include all three, the "departmental" theory in this matter being erroneous. Really there is one Mind with several functions, to which are given various names. A man is said to "determine" (*Buddhi*) who having perceived (*Manas*) and thought 'I am concerned in this matter' and thus having self-arrogated (*Ahang-kāra*) comes to the determination 'this must be done by me'.<sup>94</sup> "Must be done" here does not refer to exterior action only, but to mental

<sup>94</sup> Kartavyam etat mayā (Sāṅkhya-Tattva-Kaumudi, 23rd Kārikā).

action<sup>95</sup> also, such as any determination by the way of forming of concepts and percepts ("It is so") and resolutions ('It must be done'). It is the thinking principle which forms concepts or general ideas and is in Sāṅkhya the seat of Memory.<sup>96</sup>

From Buddhi issues,<sup>97</sup> *Ahangkāra Tattva* or as Patanjali calls it *Asmitā*, the function of which is *Abhimāna* or self-arrogation. From the cosmic standpoint *Abhimāna* is the name for that stage of evolution in which Prakṛiti first individualises Herself.<sup>98</sup> The tendency to individualisation, which is the sum and substance of Ego, become explicit and a fact in the stage of *Asmitā*. To use physical analogies, it is the appearance of a centre or nucleus or axis of operation in the cosmic

<sup>95</sup> Mānasikriyā. Action according to Indian ideas is not merely physical. The mind is constantly active.

<sup>96</sup> In Vedānta this is a special faculty as Chitta.

<sup>97</sup> The earlier Tattvas are both Prakṛiti (Producer) as regards what follows and Vikṛiti or produced as regards what precedes.

<sup>98</sup> We may get an idea of what this is like by comparing with it the state of rising from sleep in which one has first a vague experience of mere being and then of an "I".

stuff. Thus in the nebular hypothesis, to explain the solar system, for example, we require either a centre of condensation (older hypothesis) or an axis of spiraling movement (new hypothesis). That centre or axis is the Ego of the nebular cloud. So long as this centre or axis has not appeared we have no beginning of actual evolution of the cosmic dust or vapour into systems of heavenly bodies.<sup>99</sup> Asmitā, as a creative cosmic principle, should not be identified with an individual Ego which is constituted of subsequently evolved principles in the form of sensorium and senses. It is the individualising Principle in nature, the Cosmic Ego which unfolds itself into a multiplicity of individual Egos. As a cause<sup>100</sup> is the subtle state<sup>101</sup> or potential condition of its effects and not merely their sum total,<sup>102</sup> the Cosmic Ego is the subtle state of all the manifold Egos, conscious and

<sup>99</sup> Of course Prakriti or Mahat do not correspond to Nebular Bodies. The latter appear on a lower plane. Previous to that Asmitā had already manifested itself in a superior plane.

<sup>100</sup> Kārana.

<sup>101</sup> Sūkshmāvasthā.

<sup>102</sup> Samashti.

unconscious, whether in sentient beings, or material things which make our world of experience.

The individual *Ahangkāra* is the personal consciousness which realises itself as a particular "I," the experiencer. It arrogates to itself the experience offered by *Manas* and has the consciousness "I am so".<sup>103</sup> "I-making" is self-arrogation,<sup>104</sup> that is that realisation of oneself in relation with the objects of experience as a personal "I," affecting or affected by others. This is the "I" of empirical consciousness. Having so arrogated it passes on the experience to be determined by *Buddhi*.

From *Ahangkāra* issues a double<sup>105</sup> stream of evolution namely *Manas* and the *Indriyas*

---

<sup>103</sup> *Ahangākra* literally means "I-making" (faculty).

<sup>104</sup> *Abhimāna*.

<sup>105</sup> One line dominated by *Sattva* whence issue *Manas* and *Indriyas*, the other by *Tamas* whence issue the five *Bhūtas*; *Rajas Guna* helping both the *Sāttvika* and *Tāmasika* evolutions (*Parināma*) by virtue of its impulsion. In the *Tantras* (cf. *Shāradā Tilaka 1-18*) we find a threefold division of *Ahangkāra* into *Sāttvika* or *Vaikārika* which is the group of 11 *Devas* of the Senses, *Rājasika* or *Taijasa* which is the *Manas* and *Indriyas* and *Tāmasika* or *Bhautika* which is the *Tanmātras*, the origin of the *Bhūtas*.

(lower mind and senses) on the one hand and the five *Tanmātras* or Generals of the Sense-particulars on the other, evolving in their turn gross sensible Matter. Here the Principles of the subject and its faculties of mind and sense having been developed, necessarily their objects, first as subtle and then as gross, appear over against them.

The functions of Manas are (*a*) attention, (*b*) selection, (*c*) synthesising the discrete manifold of the senses. Attention must co-operate with the senses before the latter can "give" the experiencer anything at all.<sup>106</sup> Nextly, at one and the same minute the experiencer is subject to receive a countless number of sensations which come to, and press upon, him from all sides. If any of these is to be brought into the field of consciousness, it must be selected (*Sangkalpa*) to the exclusion or rejection (presupposing *Vikalpa*) of others. The process of experience is the selection of a special section from out of a general

<sup>106</sup> See J. C. Chatterji's "Hindu Realism". And so in the *Brihadāranyaka-Up.*, 13.2.7, it is said: "My Manas was diverted elsewhere therefore I did not hear."

whole and then being engaged in it so as to make it one's own, either as a particular object of thought or a particular field of operation. Thus its function is said to be *Sangkalpa-vikalpa*; that is selection and rejection from the material provided by the senses of perception. When, after having been brought into contact with the sense-objects, it selects the sensation which is to be presented to the other faculties of the mind, there is *Sangkalpa*. This presupposes a previous attitude of indecision, indiscrimination or oscillation which is *Vikalpa*. The activity of *Manas* cannot be revealed to the experiencer except through the operation of *Ahangkāra* and *Buddhi*. The images built up by *Manas*, through unconscious operation, cannot affect of themselves the experiencer, so as to move him in any way until and unless the experiencer identifies himself with them by *Ahangkāra*, that is by making them his own in feeling and experience. Lastly, as Western Psychology holds, the senses give not a completed whole, but a manifold--the manifold of sense. These "points of sensation" must be gathered together and made into an whole. These three

functions of attention, selection or discrimination and synthesising the discrete manifold belong to the leader of the senses or *Manas*. It is leader, for without it the other senses are incapable of performing their respective offices—and as these senses are those of perception and action,<sup>107</sup> *Manas*, which co-operates with both, is said to partake of the character of both cognition and action. Just as *Manas* is necessary to the senses, the latter are necessary for *Manas*. It is the seat of will and desire as the desire to perceive and act, and therefore exists in association with the senses. Through association with them it appears as manifold, being particularised or differentiated by its co-operation with that particular instrument which cannot fulfil its functions except in conjunction with it. When *Manas* has functioned it passes its experience on to *Ahangkāra* which refers that experience to the individual Ego.

The function of *Manas* has to be understood in contrast with that of the intellectual

<sup>107</sup> Jnānendriya and Karmendriya.

organs<sup>108</sup> the function of which is simple apprehension of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell without conscious discrimination and assimilation or classification. When an object comes into contact with a sense organ we have at first simple apprehension like that of a child or one stupefied.<sup>109</sup> It is the sort of perception which can be expressed by an interjection like "Oh". It is undiscriminated and unassimilated (unclassed) knowledge.<sup>110</sup> Then the internal organ Manas attends, discriminates and classifies.<sup>111</sup> Manas is ranked with the ten sense-organs. It partakes of the nature of both kinds (*Jnāna* and *Karma*) of sense-organs. All the three (*Buddhi*, *Ahangkāra*, *Manas*) however are called

<sup>108</sup> Buddhindriya or Jnānendriya. The term Indriya literally means a Linga of Indra or Ātman, an index or Upādhi of it. Here it means Sāttvikāhangkāro pādānatvāng indriyatvam that is what is evolved from the Sattva-prevailing Ahangkāra. Buddhi and Ahangkāra though practically Lingas of Atman are not themselves Indriyas.

<sup>109</sup> Sammugdha.

<sup>110</sup> Nirvikalpakam.

<sup>111</sup> Its function as Vāchaspati says, is indicated by "Idam evam naivam," "It is this, not that".

*Antahkarana*,<sup>112</sup> that is internal (*Antah*) organ or instrument of *Vyāpāra* or action (including knowing and feeling) in the most general sense of the term.<sup>113</sup>

Unlike the first Standard this view allows simultaneous as well as serial action of the inner organ and senses. On this Professor Pramathanatha Mukhyopādhyāya writes : "I think the Nyāya-vaisheshika view is only a first rough sketch of the ways of our mental life. Experience is a nameless unity, an alogical mass, an undefined universe to intuition. This is the "Fact". Then by the process of moving attention (attention moves because it is pragmatic) this mass is dissected into several elements which are the abstract

<sup>112</sup> Kriyate anena iti karanam. "Karana" is that by which something is done. This something includes feeling and knowing. There are thus four kinds of Karana according to function (*Vyapāravishesha*) namely (13 in all), Buddhi, *Ahangkāra*, Manas and the ten *Indriyas*.

<sup>113</sup> Thus the function of Buddhi, *Ahangkāra*, Manas is *Adhyavasāya*, *Abhimāna* and *Sangkalpa-vikalpa* respectively. These make the Antahkarana or Inner Organ. Then there are the outer organs, viz., organs of intellect (*Jnānendriya*) the function of which is *Alochana* or sensation and the organs of action, the functions of which are speaking, grasping, etc.

“fact sections,” that is colours, sounds, tastes, ideas, memories, anticipations and so on. Thus the Fact is *not* obtained by a synthesis of previously known and recognised fact-sections (that is by association) but the former is the original *datum*<sup>114</sup> out of which the sections are obtained by moving and exploring attention impelled by *Sangskāras*, that is obtained by dissociation. Most modern psychologists adopt this analytic view of experience. It follows therefore that the massive whole, the universe of fact can be taken in at once. It is a seamless but not a featureless unity. Scarcely can it be called an unity, for it is not a numerical fact at all. It is alogical, unreachable by the categories. We start therefore with the *whole* in which the parts are imbedded. Nor can we have this by means of a *Manas* which is atomic (*Anu*). The latter is set up to admit feelings and sensations one by one and

<sup>114</sup> This is a fundamental notion of Vedānta according to which we start with everything *viz.*, the Pūrṇa or whole. As full Consciousness itself it appears as limited modes of experience. As the great Life (Prāna) it vivifies all particular breathing organisms. It is the original *nidus* of Power whence all varied forms of matter issue.

piecemeal ; but elementary feelings and sensations, sharply discriminated from one another, appear subsequently by an analytic operation upon an alogical whole of experience which intuition already has given. How did intuition give it ? Could it have been intuited by an atomic partless *Manas* ? Then again what is precisely meant by a single elementary feeling ? Ordinarily a sound-sensation is regarded as one and as different from a colour sensation. *Nyāya-Vaisheshika* recognises atmospheric vibrations as the objective *stimuli* of sound-sensation. The vibrations are rapidly succeeding pulses of agitation. We have a great number of pulses in a short time.<sup>115</sup> Each pulse acting singly upon the ear will produce a shock of feeling. Hence when a sound has been heard for one minute only, there has been really heard a great number of individual sounds, each separately attended to and admitted by *Manas*. Theoretically of course the *Manas* can do all this. But this assumption if made to apply to the whole affair of experience, would put a needlessly

---

<sup>115</sup> The ether waves of modern physics would count several hundreds of billions in one second.

fantastic appearance on it.<sup>116</sup> I think then on the whole that experience should not be limited to seriality alone : though in the economy of mental life we have certainly to recognise a distributive and discriminative principle. This principle of distributive (as opposed to collective or massive) attention prefers to address itself to the sections of experience one by one and when confined between two objects commonly oscillates between them.<sup>117</sup> Preferential regard to one section is *Sangkalpa* and the act of oscillation *Vikalpa*.<sup>118</sup> And this regarding and oscillating principle is *Manas*.

<sup>116</sup> Compare on this point the view of W. K. Clifford who posits an atom of feeling (not conscious) as the counterpart of each elementary nervous shock induced by each individual objective stimulus (e.g., a single wave of luminiferous ether). These atoms of feeling do not aggregate and compound themselves below the threshold of Consciousness but each forces itself up into Consciousness where they all compound and blend together as one sensation. See his Lectures and Essays and for criticism W. James Principles of Psychology, Vol. I.

<sup>117</sup> See Prof. Pramathanātha Mukhyopādhyāya's "Approaches to Truth".

<sup>118</sup> *Manas* is called *Sangkalpavikalpātmaka*. In Vedānta, stress is sometimes laid on the *vikalpa* aspect ; thus Vedānta-Paribhāshā places the characteristic of *Manas* in *Sangshaya*, and Panchadashi in *Vimarsha* (meaning doubt or indecision).

Preferential regard is the bestowal of emphasis on a portion of a given continuum<sup>119</sup> by which the portion becomes especially vivid and interesting and the rest veiled. In such preferential regard therefore there is not absolute engagement with one to the exclusion of others. It is merely the apex of a curve of presentation. Similarly in oscillating, the objects only alternately rise and sink as regards emphasis, as attention vibrates between them : there is commonly no complete withdrawal from the other when attention dwells upon one. So much as regards common experience. In it there is undoubtedly a tendency to mono-valued (referring wholly and exclusively to one) attention : we require such attention in the interests of our practical life. The Nyāya view of *Manas* takes the limit of this tendency in the mathematical sense. In other words it conceives *Manas* as the perfection of this tendency : thus the normal curve of presentation dwindles into a point,<sup>120</sup> thus

---

<sup>119</sup> e.g., on the star Sirius in a clear sky.

<sup>120</sup> Professor P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya gives the following example: Thus instead of saying while eating an orange I have a massive experience of taste, smell, sight, muscular effort and sound together, in

carrying to a theoretical limit a tendency that is certainly unmistakable in our normal experiences."

" Besides that distributive and oscillating principle (which may be called *Manas* though we need not go so far as to conceive it as literally *Anu*) we have to recognise in our mental life a principle of intuition or massive experience. The whole *Antahkarana* or Inner organ (involving *Buddhi*, *Ahangkāra* and *Manas*, as assumed by *Sāṅkhya* and *Vedānta*) will better explain life by their respective activities than the simple atomic inner sense (*Antarindriya*) *Manas* alone as assumed by the *Nyāya*-*vaisheshika*. We have however, not wholly discarded the atomic view of *Manas*. We interpret it as the absolute limit of a tendency to distributive and oscillatory attention which normally operates in life but not to an absolute degree. *Nyāya* will apply the

---

which the first two probably occupy the apex of the curve of presentation and the rest lie somewhere in the slopes, it says that I have and can have one sensation only at a time (*Manas* being *Anu*) and that the *Manas* on account of its lightness passes rapidly between the different succeeding sensations and thereby produces the illusory experience of co-existent apprehension.

absolute limit itself to the explanation of ordinary knowledge (*Jnāna*) and has therefore to dismiss simultaneous apprehension as an illusory appearance."

The senses co-operate with *Manas*. Sensations aroused by sense-objects are experienced by means of the outer instruments (*Bāhyakarana*) as contrasted with the Inner Instrument (*Antahkarana*) which are the gateways through which the *Jīva* or individual receives worldly experience. Their function is *Ālochana* or sensation. An *Indriya* or sense is not the physical organ such as eye or ear, but a faculty of the general mind, ultimately *Buddhi*, operating through that organ as its instrument. The outward sense organs are the usual means whereby on the physical plane the functions of hearing and seeing and so forth are accomplished. But as they are mere instruments and their power is derived from the mind, a Yogi may accomplish by the mind only all that may be done by means of these physical organs without the use of the latter. So it is said that a hypnotised subject can perceive things even when no use of the special physical organs, ordinarily necessary for the

purpose, is made. By the instrumentality of the senses things are perceived and action is taken with reference to them. They are not however sufficient in themselves for this purpose. They cannot work unless in co-operation with their chief the *Manas*. Thus unless there is attention there is no sensation at all. To be absent-minded, as the term is, is not to know what is happening. The mind is always and unconsciously being affected by what is happening, but these do not rise to a conscious level unless *Manas* functions as attention and selection and synthesises sensation.

The Senses are of two classes in which there are each five. The first class are organs of sensation and perception (*Jnānen-driya*) working through the sensory nervous system namely hearing by the ear, feeling as touch by the skin, seeing by the eye, tasting by the tongue and smelling by the nose.

The Antahkarana together with its functions constitutes an organic unity, so that neither the different aspects of it, nor their respective functions are to be set in sharp contrast to one another. The fact that they

derive from a common root precludes any exclusive scheme of partition. The question therefore is merely one of relative emphasis. In this way, the *Manas* presents and discriminates; *Ahangkāra* owns or arrogates to itself; and *Buddhi* decides and resolves. These are the three principal stages and forms of mental functioning: some object is presented; it is owned; and then action is taken with reference to it. Besides these, we may have a function by which past impressions are recollected: this is *Chitta*, according to the Vedāntic classification. While this is clear it must be observed that, in a careful psychological analysis, the processes, *viz.*, presentation, apperception (self-arrogation) and resolution will be found to involve and presuppose one another. Just as *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*, though always acting conjointly, are often referred to separately, according as one or either of the other two predominates, so also is the case here. *Manas* presents and discriminates, but it also does, though not prominently and consciously, what *Ahangkāra* and *Buddhi* do; that is to say, when *Manas* acts, the whole *Antahkarana* acts through it, though its

functioning may have its emphasis, during such action, upon discriminating presentation. That it is so can be shown by psychological analysis. Discriminating presentation does involve an element, though sub-conscious, of both owning and acting (*i.e.*, the functions of *Ahangkāra* and *Buddhi*). In other words, when *Manas* acts, we have the actions of the other two *implicit* in it, which analysis may bring out. What is true of *Manas*, is also true of *Ahangkāra* and *Buddhi*: while these latter act, the whole Antahkarana acts. None can act in isolation. During the working of *Ahangkāra* and *Buddhi*, the places of emphasis have shifted; what was implicit in *Manas* has now become explicit. This follows *à priori* from the principle that they have a common root and have the same essential constitution; so that what is in the one is also, though in a different bearing, in the others;—an application of the principle that what is here is everywhere, and what is not here is nowhere. It follows also that one can be made to do the work which the others can normally do. Thus the sense-organs which *normally* exclude one another as regards their function, may be

made to do the works of one another ; e.g., the sense of touch can be made to see.<sup>121</sup> In modern hypnotic experiments also, such *exchange* of sense function is sometimes observed. All this is possible because the sense-organs have a common root, and because the *Jīva*, in his entirety, functions through each, though the modes and emphases of operation are different in different organs. Much more is this true of the organs of the Antahkarana. The second class of senses are senses of action, which are the reactive response which the self makes to sensation, working through the motor nervous system, namely mouth, hands, lips, anus, and genitals whereby speaking, grasping and holding, walking, excretion and procreation are performed, and through which effect is given to the *Jīva*'s desires. These two classes are afferent and efferent impulses respectively. The fact of there being a variety of actions does not necessarily involve the same number of Indriyas. An act of "going" done by the

---

<sup>121</sup> Gotama, the compiler of the Nyāya-Sūtras did this, and accordingly he is also called Akṣapāda, i.e., one who saw with his feet.

hand (as by a cripple) is to be regarded really as an operation of the Indriya of feet (Padendriya) even though the hand is ordinarily the seat of the Indriya for handling.<sup>122</sup>

### § 6

In the next volume I will examine exclusively the concept "Matter". Here however a few words are necessary. None of the six systems regards Matter from the Physico-chemical standpoint of science but from the psychological standpoint which regards its effect on the mind and senses. It has been said<sup>123</sup> that the division of matter from the standpoint of the possibility of our sensations, has a firm root in our nature as cognising beings, and has therefore a better rational footing than the modern chemical division of matter into elements in compounds which are being daily threatened by the gradual advancement of scientific culture. They carry with them (the

---

<sup>122</sup> Tantrasāra Āhnika 8. The Kashmirian work of that name and not the Compendium by Krishnā-nanda Āgamavāgisha.

<sup>123</sup> The Study of Patanjali by Prof. Surendranath Dasgupta, p. 178 (University of Calcutta).

author above mentioned observes) no fixed and consistent rational conception as the definitions of the ancients did, but are mere makeshifts for understanding or representing certain chemical changes of matter and have therefore only a relative value. Gross matter, as the possibility of sensation, has been divided into five classes according to their relative grossness corresponding to the relative grossness of the senses. These divisions are called "Ether" (*Ākāsha*), "Air" (*Vāyu*), "Fire" (*Tejas*), "Water" (*Aप*), "Earth" (*Prithivi*). The English names are merely literal translations of the Sanskrit words. It must not be understood that *Prithivi* is Earth in the ordinary English sense of the word, and so with the rest. Gross, that is sensible matter is, in all the systems, called *Bhūta*. All the systems posit certain elements of which it is composed. These are called by the First Standard *Paramānu* that is supremely small points of substance and, when massive enough, stimuli of sensation. Their place is taken in the second and third Standards by the *Tanmātra* or Generals of the sense-particulars that is Universals. The respective characteristics of these are compared later.

Philosophy has drawn a distinction between primary and secondary qualities, and regards in such case the former set alone as really inhering in matter and elements of matter, whilst secondary qualities are only effects produced upon a percipient subject by the primary set. The Indian systems recognise no such partition, holding that the arguments which prove that some of the properties are objective will also prove that the rest are equally so. If the external and sensible world exists it cannot consistently be maintained that any of its properties are subjective.<sup>124</sup> The material minima or *Paramāṇus* possess both set of qualities. All the qualities, primary or secondary, are in the thing, and matter therefore is what it appears to us to be, subject to individual imperfections (*Dosha*) in perception. It is seen perfectly as the Universals and combination of universals in yoga-consciousness. On this ground all the systems are thoroughly realist.<sup>125</sup> The minima again

---

<sup>124</sup> See my volume "Reality". The Gunas, Karmas, and Relations exist in the things themselves.

<sup>125</sup> Thus greenness is in the leaf and not in the perceiving subject. See my "Reality".

originate all these qualities in sensible matter because they themselves possess both.<sup>126</sup> The general properties<sup>127</sup> of sensible things are those which are never absent from any one of them. These may be perceived by more senses than one, and in masses of things only differ in degree and not in kind. These correspond to a certain extent with the so-called primary qualities of matter. There are however special qualities which are distinguished from the former in that they are perceptible by a single sense only, and they differ in masses of things not in degree only but in kind. They are therefore essentially different from one another and correspond to some of the so-called secondary qualities of Western Philosophy. These are touch and feel, colour and form, flavour and odour.<sup>128</sup> There are

<sup>126</sup> It is a fundamental maxim of this standard that the qualities (*guna*) in the effects (*kāryya*) are due to the previous existence of them in the Cause (*kārana*). So it is said (Vaish. IV—1—3) *Kārana-bhāvāt Kārya-bhavah*, which as the Upaskāra of Shangkara Mishra explains, means *kārana-guna-pūrvakā hi kārya-gunā bhavanti*.

<sup>127</sup> Sāmanya Guna.

<sup>128</sup> Sparsha, Rūpa, Rasa, Gandha.

things from which one or the other of these qualities can never be eliminated so long as they exist as those things. The distinctive quality is of their essence.<sup>129</sup>

As the *Paramānus* are supersensible and non-spatial entities they are incapable of any distinction from one another in regard to size, shape, weight, density, or any other form of measure. But they may be and are classified with reference to the qualities which they produce in the different forms of sensible things that are themselves the product of the *Paramānus*.

The Naiyayikas hold that the only differences (*Visheshas*) between the four classes of minima are their differing *Adrishtas* (V. post). Therefore, according to the latter one Point of a particular class cannot have a form (*Rūpa*) different from that of another *Paramānu* or Point of the same class. According, however, to the Vaisheshikas, each Point, even of the same class, is believed to have its own particular, individual characteristics

---

<sup>129</sup> Musk can never be imagined as without odour so long as it remains musk, while pure water need not have any smell at all.

(*Visheshas*). Thus to explain the actual particulars, Visheshas are put into the *Paramānus* themselves, thus practically robbing them of the universality which they ought, in theory, to possess. The partless Points of subtle matter like their gross aggregates or sensible matter, (for matter is throughout whether as molecular mass or atom the same) exist in the all-pervading continuum or Ether (*Ākāsha*) and are, therefore, subjected to the action of two other entities and forces, namely, *Kāla*, a general principle of movement, and *Dik*, a principle which holds things together in a particular position, which forces, by their operation, give rise in the percipient to the notions of relations called Time and Spatial Position. The *Paramānus* have severally no immanent dynamism though they have energy of position. They receive their initial motion from the First Mover or God: though as entities, they are eternal and are, therefore, not created by Him.

We here pass from the pluralism and metaphysical realism of the first standard to the Dualism of the second, and from it to the Non-dualism of the third standard which is that

here adopted. These systems I have shortly described elsewhere,<sup>130</sup> and I deal here only with their concept of Matter. Both the second and third standards replace the *Paramānus* by what they call the *Tanmātras* which are five in number, namely, "Ether," "Air," "Fire," "Water," and "Earth," that is objective motions and forces which give rise to the five sensations of hearing, touch, sight, taste and smell. They are Generals of the Sense Particulars, or Types or Universals. *Tanmātra* means literally "that only" or "thatness". The "thatness" or General of the sense particulars is of each of the five classes. The mingling of these *Tanmātras* which like the *Paramānus* are super-sensible, and their combinations when so mingled go to make up gross sensible matter or *Bhūta* by the accretion of Mass or *Tamas*. The nature of the *Tanmātra* is little understood.

In order to understand what a *Tanmātra* is we may take this sheet of paper. 'What is it?' It is a particular form (*rūpa*) seen by the eye, a particular cause of sensation

---

<sup>130</sup> See "Reality".

as touch (*sparsha*) and has a particular odour (*gandha*) and so forth. Subjectively, the paper=this particular form, touch and odour. But what is it objectively or in itself? Scepticism says it is unknown and unknowable. Agnosticism says the thing in itself is an X which is unknown. Realism says the thing in itself resembles the paper as known or perceived. To what extent does it resemble? Scientific realism says that the resemblance holds only as regards what are called primary qualities. Hindu Realism in all the three standards does not restrict the resemblance to the so-called primary qualities alone, i.e., the paper in itself has real form, real odour, real touch and so forth. But has the paper in itself a particular form and so forth which a subject may perceive in it? Different subjects may have different perceptions of the paper. The same object may be perceived differently under different circumstances. A Scientist by his apparatus may perceive in his way, what the ordinary man does not. A *Yogi* may have still another perception and so on. All these different perceptions of one and the same thing cannot be

real. Hence it is said that the real form and so forth of the paper in itself are such as are perceived by a Standard Subject possessing an Absolute Eye and so forth. This standard or ideal subject is that aspect of Consciousness which is called Hiranyagarbha, a plane which Yogīs may reach. They see both the *Tanmātras*<sup>131</sup> and the combination of *Tanmātras* which when they become sensible or *Bhūta* constitute the gross bodies of all particular beings. These are then seen perfectly, that is without any defect (*Dosha*) which is due to the action of inherited tendency (*Sangskāra*) of any kind. For it is to be remembered that man's mind is never *tabula rasa* but a complex of impressions and therefore tendencies produced by previous actions (*karma*). The ordinary man's perception of the paper is of the paper in itself perceived subject to the limitations of the defects (*dosha*) in him.

Examining this paper of perception we find (1) that it is gross (*Sthūla*) in the sense that it is patent; (2) that it is particular giving us

---

<sup>131</sup> The *Tanmātras* are seen by Yogis by that form of yoga-drishti which is called *Savichāra Samprajnāta Samādhi*.

mere sense particulars ; (3) that it is a complexus of form, odour and so forth, *i.e.*, heterogeneous ; and (4) that it is variable according to the circumstances and instruments of perception. A man's actual sense-datum possesses these four characteristics. Upon an analysis, however, with a view to discover the elements which underlie this sense-datum, it becomes clear that the elements to be real, *i.e.*, to be real elements of the paper in itself, must present the following characteristics : (1) they must not be gross but subtle (*Sūkshma*) ; (2) they must not be particular but generic or universal. Thus, if we take a particular form and colour such as whiteness of this paper, the very elements which make up this whiteness ought not to be particular. The particularity must arise out of the particular grouping (*Sangyoga*) of the elements. Particularity may also be due to the speciality of the instruments of a given subject's sense activity. If the elements themselves be particular, then they are not elements and they are not, as the Pātanjala Yoga Shāstra says, *Avisheshas*.<sup>132</sup> (3) They must not be complex :

<sup>132</sup> See Pātanjala Sūtra, II. 19.

they must be simple or homogeneous in quality : otherwise, they are not elements. Thus each distinct species of colour must in itself be conceived as homogeneous in quality.<sup>133</sup> (4) They must not be variable, *i.e.*, they must be such as exist for a standard or ideal subject. It is these generic, simple, subtle and standard or ideal elements of our particular, complex, gross and variable sense-data which are the *Tanmātras* which again are the material causes of gross, sensible matter or the *Bhūtās*. Simplicity and subtlety, however, do not necessarily suggest that those elements are atomic. Being the elements of sense-data, they are necessarily of five kinds—sound, touch, form and colour, taste and smell—(*Shabda*, *Sparsha*, *Rūpa*, *Rasa* and *Gandha*). But each is a family or class name. Thus, the sound universal or *Shabda Tanmātra* means an hierarchy of generic sounds beginning with the *summum genus* or ‘*Om*’<sup>134</sup> down to the

<sup>133</sup> Thus “apple green” must always be of the same shade and the same shade throughout whereas the particular “apple greens” vary.

<sup>134</sup> The Mantra Om is the approximate Natural Name and sound of the first general and massive movement in the evolution of the universe. From this

*infima species* (Ka, Kha, Ga, etc.). It excludes, however, the mere particulars, such as the sound Ka and other sounds as actually spoken by this man or that. The same applies to touch, form, taste and smell. There is a logical as distinguished from a temporal evolution from the *summum genus* to the *infima species*. The further evolution under the action of Consciousness as power (*Chit Shakti*) of mere sense-particulars from the orders of the *Tanmātras* or Universals is the creation of gross sensible matter (*Sthūla Bhūta*).

What, then, is the World of the Universals as experienced by those who attain to it<sup>135</sup> that is, to those whose mind is a Standard Mind? In the first place then, a thing really is as it appears.

come the particular heterogeneous movements : just as from Om come all the particular letters, which are themselves sound aspects of particular movements. See my "Garland of Letters".

<sup>135</sup> Shangkarāchārya discusses the universals which he calls Ākritis or persistent Types under Vedānta Sūtra, I, 3, 28. He speaks of Devatā Types, Sound Types, etc. From the Indian standpoint the universals are *ante rem* as existing in the creative "Mind" of God, *in re* as the thing perfectly perceived and *post rem* as images of finite constructive thinking, as mental abstractions from the particulars.

It is seen perfectly free from all the defects which attach to minds which are not Standard Minds. It is thus, in this sense, a perfect world. But from this perfect standpoint what are physical and moral ugliness, physical imperfection and vice? It must be remembered in the first place that 'ugly' and 'vicious' are terms of man's æsthetic and moral judgments which on account of his imperfections (*Dosha*) are neither just nor correct measures of ugliness and vice. In the standard of perfect perception, the ugliness or viciousness of a thing or action must be absolutely just and in correct proportions. Thus from a man's standpoint, he may either over-estimate or under-estimate both. He may either see ugliness or vice where there is none. To a Standard Mind everything will be in the fulness of its bearings and therefore ugliness or vice seen perfectly is an absolutely just and correct estimate of either. From the perfect standpoint again, neither in the ordinary sense may ever exist, for from that standpoint everything is a play (*Lilā*) of the Perfect Consciousness (*Chid-Vilāsa* of the *Sachchidānandamayī Shakti*).

It must also be remembered that ugliness and beauty, good and evil are relative. What is beautiful to one pair of eyes may be hideous to another. One has only to remember in the former connection the varying ideas which exist upon the subject of woman's beauty and her fashions. The figure of Kālī Devī is repugnant to the European. The Indian is drawn towards it. To him on the other hand the Christian's references to the "blood of the Lamb," the purification (of Mithraic origin) by blood, are sickening and repellent. As regards good and evil, what is fear and pain in the deer is joy and pleasure in the tiger, which devours it. The act of the assassin who stabs a Ruler in the dark may bring the light of liberty to his people. The betrayal of Judas, infamous as it was in itself, was yet for the Christian a necessary stage in God's scheme for the redemption of mankind and so on. Like the child's jig-saw puzzle what appears crooked, unintelligible in the part may be harmonious in the whole.

If we compare the *Paramānu* and *Tanmātra* we find certain similarities and certain differences. Whilst the first is an abstract and

rigid model, the latter is a more concrete one and more easily usable. In fact the higher Standards attempt to complete and clear up what the First Standard leaves incomplete and implicit. Thus comparing the points enumerated in the description of the *Paramānu*

(a) The *Tanmātras* are elements of sense experience regarded as objective, that is categories of sense experience objectified.

(b) They are simple as elements of sense experience, but are not simple in relation to the individualising principle in consciousness (*Asmitā* or *Ahangkāra*) from which or under the action of which they are derived.

(c) They have origination (*utpatti*) and dissolution (*laya*), though there is no absolute destruction of them. They originate from the Principle named and are dissolved again into it which is again dissolved in the mental principle *Buddhi* and that again into the psycho-material cause of all (Prakriti) or in the one Consciousness (*Chit*) according to the Sāṅkhya or Vedānta respectively. Therein they exist as potency.

(d) Universality which is logically involved in the *Paramānus* is fully brought out in the *Tanmātra* which is manifestly a category.

(e) A *Tanmātra* is

not necessarily something "atomic" and "partless". To conceive it one need not conceive it as a Point. It may be extended or massive, only that mass must not be heterogeneous and variable in quality. It may thus have any magnitude varying from the point (*Anu*) to the infinitely great (*Mahat*). In fact a given magnitude, whether infinitely small or infinitely great, is not an inseparable proprium of a *Tanmātra*. Whilst we should not say that a *Tanmātra* has no magnitude, we should not say also that it has always a given magnitude. Thus whilst a *Paramānu* has no magnitude in the sense that it is only a point, a *Tanmātra* may be said to have no magnitude in the sense that it is not necessarily bound up with any magnitude.

It must be noted also that the *Tanmātra* has also objective magnitude, though not in the ordinary sense. A mental object (say an image) is not a subjective phenomenon only : it is in the mind but at the same time it is a real otherness as a condition of stress and strain in the universal ether or cosmic stuff. It can thus be transmitted from mind to mind.<sup>136</sup> Therefore

<sup>136</sup> See volume "Reality" dealing with Perception and the Mind-Ray.

as a stress and strain form it must have some magnitude, and regarded as a condition of the cosmic stuff this may be called objective.

An essential difference between the *Parāmanu* and *Tanmātra* consists in the fact that the former is an eternal, independently existing, objective reality. It is as equally real as the Mind which perceives it and lasts as long as the Mind lasts. But the *Tanmātra* like the mind is not eternal but a product of the individualising principle of consciousness (*asmitā*) or (*ahangkāra*) which is again a product of that tendency in the Cosmic Consciousness (*buddhi*) which is realised in the next stage as a limited self-conscious centre, and which tendency again is a transformation of the Supreme Power (*Mahāshakti* or God's Will) as both material and efficient cause, known in Shākta worship as the Mother. Since the Mother-Power is the material cause of the universe, all its effects as particular objects therein, are forms of Her power. She is present in, and as, all things, which are themselves possessed of an inherent Dynamism by which they are evolved, maintained and dissolved again into their Supreme Cause. As

that Cause is Pure Consciousness and Experience (*Chit* or *Samvit*) all that exists is a form of that. Mind is a limited form of Consciousness as the finite subject. Matter is a limited form of consciousness as the finite object. At base they are one Power. In pure Consciousness a movement takes place which, at first knows itself as its own object, that is, as part of itself, and then as different from itself. This difference itself, as object, unfolds from within itself, on the rise of cosmic memory, the Generals of the sense-particulars and the particular sensible matter. Mind and matter are themselves ultimately twin aspects of the one Consciousness as Power: as *Chit-shakti* and *Māyā-shakti*.

The Mind or subject is one form of stress and strain in the cosmic substance. Matter or object whether gross or subtle is another. Both Mind and Matter are forms of the one Substance. In their ground they are one. Both subtle and gross matter are objective to the mind, in the sense that they are other than, and objects of, its operation. But the objects vary firstly, in that gross matter consists of particulars and subtle matter is the Universals.

Secondly, gross matter is what its name means namely matter made massive by increment of *Tamas*. By reason of this massiveness it becomes perceptible to the senses which subtle matter as *Paramānu* or *Tanmātra* is not. The movement towards manifestation is throughout both a coarsening and a becoming more definite, particular, and heterogeneous. These characteristics are shown on both sides of the duality into which the one substance bifurcates, namely Mind and Matter. Popularly we think of gross sensible Matter as something occupying space outside the body. This attitude is the result of the increasing definition, particularity, and coarsening of both mind and matter. They thus recede more and more from one another. In the case of subtle matter the two sides make nearer approach.

Perception (*Pratyaksha*) is explained in the second Standard as follows : The *Purushas* or Spirits are many and their nature is pure Consciousness. *Prakriti* is one and is indescribable except as the unconscious Source of Mind and Matter, which are as unconscious as their origin. *Purusha* and *Prakriti* are two separate independent realities. Experience is

of two kinds. It is either the pure experience of the *Purusha* dissociated from *Prakriti*, or the limited experience of the *Purusha* in association with *Prakriti*. The result of such association is an apparent combination of consciousness and unconsciousness—"apparent" because Consciousness is ever unchanged and unaffected. The apparent combination of the two is the individual being or *Jīva*. Outer objects (*Arthas*) affect the sense-organs (*Indriya*). The *Manas* attends to and thus selects one or other from the field of objects and places it before the other faculties of the Inner organ namely the I-Making (*Ahangkāra*) and determining (*Buddhi*) faculties.<sup>137</sup> *Sattva* or the factor manifesting consciousness prevails in the latter and there is determination (*Adhyavasāya*).<sup>138</sup> This modification (*Vṛitti*)

---

<sup>137</sup> Antahkarana, that is Buddhi, *Ahangkāra*, *Manas*.

<sup>138</sup> e.g., In a dim light my sight merely apprehends an object I know not what. *Manas* attends and makes it out to be an enemy aiming his weapon at me (here discrimination and classification have been made). Then I refer this to the self (*Ahangkāra*) and see that I am the object of his intention. Then finally I make up my mind (*Adhyavasāya*) by *Buddhi* to avoid his weapon by moving away. As to the nature and trueness of perception, see my "Reality".

of *Buddhi* is unconscious.<sup>139</sup> Hence for knowledge it is necessary that the illumination of Consciousness should fall on *Buddhi* and its function upon which they appear *as if* conscious.

A similar account is given in the *Yogaśāstra* of Patanjali, where *Chitta* is the general term for the Inner Organ. The external object acts through the sense-channel on *Chitta* and this occasions it to unconsciously evolve.<sup>140</sup> *Sattva* is said to be "transparent" and manifesting.<sup>141</sup> Hence it takes on the form of the external object,<sup>142</sup> a fact of importance to remember when dealing with the rationale of the rituals which are concerned with the transformation of *Chitta*. But as evolution of *Chitta* is unconscious, the light of *Purusha* is reflected on the state of *Chitta*: or the reflection of *Chitta* is cast on *Purusha* or they cast reflection on each other.<sup>143</sup> By such reflection there is an

<sup>139</sup> Achetana.

<sup>140</sup> In *Sāttvika parināma* as Vāchaspati has it.

<sup>141</sup> Svachchha and Prakāshaka.

<sup>142</sup> Vāhya-vastūparāga.

<sup>143</sup> According to various views, the latter being that of Vijnānabhikshu.

appearance of the state of *Chitta* looking like a conscious state, a state of *Purusha* himself. As long as there are modifications (*Vritti*) of the *Chitta* or Mind the *Purusha* becomes falsely identified with *Vritti* which is not his own. This is a virtual and not real identification. In non-yoga state the *Purusha*, though still really pure, appears to be impure on account of the virtual image of *Chitta-vritti* or mental modification falling on it. Yoga therefore is the stoppage of all modifications of the Mind,<sup>144</sup> when the witness or *Purusha* shines in his own pristine purity.

In modern parlance Consciousness and Mind are not two different things. This Standard assumes them to be two separate and independently existing things. "Reflection" and so forth merely means that interaction between Consciousness and unconscious Mind and Matter takes place without affectation of the former. Consciousness never ceases to be what it is, but its association with unconscious mind gives the latter the appearance of consciousness, and at the same time Consciousness

---

<sup>144</sup> *Yogash chitta-vritti-nirodhah* (Patanjali).

seems to be limited as the object which it illuminates. We are conscious but know that our consciousness is limited. There is some force which apparently limits it and which appears as mind and matter. A more attractive view is that taken by the Monistic Shākta doctrine of Power: Being is one with twin aspects—as Consciousness and as the Consciousness-Power whereby it appears to contract consciousness as Mind which is then presented with its co-relative Matter. It is Consciousness which appears through its Power as unconsciousness and not unconsciousness which through reflection (*Ābhāsa*) appears conscious.

A modification or *Vritti* is in Sāṅkhya and Māyāvāda Vedānta an *actual transformation* of the Mind-Stuff (*Chitta*) but is only an imputation so far as pure consciousness (*Chit*) or *Purusha* is concerned.<sup>145</sup> The *Antahkarana* of Sāṅkhya = the *Chitta* of Yoga: and this bears no parallelism to the Nyāya *Manas*. The *Chitta*

<sup>145</sup> Cf. Yogasūtra (2. 20) Drashtā drishimātrah shuddho'pi pratyayānupashyah. The witness, though only Seer and pure, appears to own and enjoy the Pratyayas or Vrittis.

is not partless and therefore unchanging. On the contrary being a transformation (*Vikāra*) of the Natural Principle *Prakṛiti*, it is composite,<sup>146</sup> ceaselessly changing. Even in final dissolution<sup>147</sup> when it lapses into *Prakṛiti*-stuff this latter has still homogeneous change as distinguished from heteropathic change.<sup>148</sup> The essential character of *Prakṛiti* and all its derivatives is change and unconsciousness, just as unchanging consciousness is the nature of the Sāṅkhyan *Purusha* and Vedāntic *Chit*.

In later Vedāntic works a considerable part of the Sāṅkhya doctrine has been assimilated. Thus *Prakṛiti* of the latter appears as the *Māyā* of the former, though not of course as an

<sup>146</sup> As *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*.

<sup>147</sup> *Mahāpralaya*, and also in what in Yoga is *Nirbijā Samādhi*.

<sup>148</sup> By the first or *Sadrisha parināma* is meant 'Change in its own given condition'. The changed state is equivalent to the changing state, e.g., in *Mahāpralaya*, it is in the state of equilibrium (*Sāmyāvasthā*) of *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas* and changes so as to maintain this state of equilibrium : the change not upsetting the equilibrium. But in creation (*Srishti*) Change is not of this character but *Visadrisha parināma*. One relation of the *Gunas* changes into another different from it and so on.

independent principle, for the Vedānta of which we write is monistic. In the same way the notion of Prakṛiti as constituted of three factors or *Gunas*<sup>149</sup> is accepted. Still more is this the case with Śākta doctrine, which is based on the Sāṅkhya with this difference, that it also denies that *Prakṛiti* is an independent principle. There is one Brahman of two aspects static and kinetic. As pure unchanging Consciousness It is the one Shiva who takes the place of the plurality of liberated selves. Active Consciousness is the Power which effects change and appears as changing unconscious mind and matter. It is the One Supreme Power or Shakti (*Mahāshakti Ādyā-Shakti*) who takes the place of the independent Sāṅkhyan *Prakṛiti*, though the name *Prakṛiti* is retained. She is the Divine Mother (*Ambikā*) of all. As the Power of Consciousness or Shiva, or more strictly Consciousness as Power, She has two aspects—Her supreme or own (*Svarūpa*) aspect in which She is (as is Shiva) Pure Consciousness<sup>150</sup>, and an aspect in which She appears as

<sup>149</sup> V. ante, p. 35.

<sup>150</sup> Chidrūpā or Chinmayishakti. This is Parā Shakti.

the universe. As such She is *Māyā Shakti* constituted of the three *Gunas*.<sup>151</sup> It is She then who appears in and as mind and matter, who is both the Form which is these and the Spirit which ensouls them. The Sāṅkhyan Prakṛiti has been personified but without ground. Rather is *Prakṛiti* a dark impersonal form, a veil, a mystery, like the *Māyā* of Śaṅkarāchāryya's Vedānta.

To the Śākta on the other hand the Mother of the world is a Divine Person, the Supreme "I" (*Pūrnāham*) in which all other limited Egos are. She is not and cannot be some independent Principle, for She is the Power of Śiva and Power and Power-holder (*Shaktimān*) are one. Man is threefold as Spirit, Mind, Body. As Spirit he is Śiva who, in Himself, is pure Consciousness. As Mind and body he is Śiva as Power, or "God in Action" or *Shakti*. That Power contracts consciousness in those subject to it.<sup>152</sup>

<sup>151</sup> Trigunamayishakti. These Gunas are gross forms of Her as the Powers of Knowledge, Will and Action.

<sup>152</sup> This is Avidyā-Shakti (ignorance). The Devi or Mother as Māyā is not affected by the Power She

The same Power in the liberating aspect expands man's consciousness until it becomes infinite and one with Hers. *Māyā Shakti* is the Mother Herself as the World-Creatrix. *Avidyā Shakti* is the Mother in the form of man and all other beings and things. These are a mixture of Consciousness-unconsciousness, for in this world neither exists alone. There is no pure consciousness (for that means no world,) except for the Yoga-Experience which transcends world-experience. Nothing on the other hand is absolutely unconscious, for Consciousness is immanent in all beings and things. What seems to be unconscious is the Mother hiding Herself under the veil of forms: the thicker the veil (the more of Tamas Guna as the Hindu would say) the more apparently unconscious a being or thing appears to be. All is Consciousness. All is Brahman. All is the Mother whose power it is to obscure Her changeless Self in changing forms of Mind and Matter. Consciousness is the Mother-Power in Its supreme nature (*Svarūpa*). Mind is a veiled form of that Power. Matter is a more densely wields. What is in Her called *Māyā* is in the individual, subject to it, *Avidyā*.

veiled form of the same. Throughout we are in union with the Supreme I (*Aham*).

Here we pass from the mere philosophising of Sāṅkhya to Shākta worship. So far however as its philosophical basis is concerned, it agrees, subject to modifications mentioned, with Sāṅkhya and generally with ordinary Vedāntic views as to the nature of Mind and its faculties and Matter and its properties.<sup>153</sup> Consciousness is of course distinct from Mind. The former is mindless Being. Mind however does not exist otherwise than in association with consciousness with which it is intermingled. Indian Mind=*Antahkarana* or Inner organ=the three species of subjective activity or functioning, viz., *Buddhi*,

<sup>153</sup> I am here concerned only with the nature of Mind and its faculties. There are differences both as to essentials such as Māyā, Vivartta and Parināma (see as to the distinction, Vedānta-paribhāshā, Vedānta-kalpa-taru-parimala on Sūtra 1—2—21 and Siddhantalesha of Appaya-dikshita); cosmogony through Apanchikrita Bhūtas (See Rāghavabhātta Comm. on Shāradā Tilaka, 1—27 as to this, Trivitkarana and the nature of bodies of Devas, water and earth-dwellers, etc.) and details such as inclusion of Prāna amongst the Tattvas, Chitta (memory) as a separate Tattva and so on.

*Ahangkāru, Manas* above described, illumined by Consciousness.

Consciousness is the causal body, for out of it is evolved Mind and other elements of the subtle body, sheathed in Matter as the gross body. Between mind and matter there is no *essential* difference. They are each forms of the one Substance-Energy or Supreme Power, variously veiled and in differing collocations. There is no real partition<sup>154</sup> between "unextended" mind and "extended" matter. Both are abstractions of concrete experience which in itself is always extensive and even Immense (hence the term Brahman which is infinite Consciousness or Experience) and unbounded. One section of this we call subjective (Mind) and another section objective and external (Matter). But Extensiveness or Massiveness belongs to both. Experience is always extensive in the sense that experience is always an universe

---

<sup>154</sup> Professor P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya favours me with the following (summarised with some observations of my own) note on extensiveness and extension which represents views expressed in his "Approaches to Truth" and "Patent Wonder", portion of his work on Indian Culture.

composed of many elements of feeling, ideas, and so forth in which our practical interest emphasises a few features and veils the rest though given.<sup>155</sup> The experience of the limited or Measured (universe) is actually (though not pragmatically) that of the Unmeasured (Brahman). Man is thus always experiencing Brahman without recognising it. (The teaching of Monistic Vedāntic and in particular Shākta teaching<sup>156</sup> is that we must ever recognise this. If man's experience is thus unified with Brahman then the world is a true source of enjoyment, and liberating timeless Bliss is in this way, and according to the perfection of such recognition, attained. It is said in the Tantras that the world was created in and by Bliss. The birth of the world gives no pangs to the

<sup>155</sup> Thus when I say that I am seeing a star I am actually seeing many though one prominently. Besides at that moment I have also other kinds of sensations (sounds, smells, touches, etc.), which I ignore because they happen to be irrelevant to my present purpose.

<sup>156</sup> "Particular" because to it everything is Brahman in the fullest sense. Its Māyā being Brahman itself as Power.

World-Mother. It is the separation from and ignoring of Her which is pain in the creature.)

Apart from what was stated previous to this interposition, "Extensive" does not mean immense or unbounded necessarily. It means an experience that has a field having any magnitude and not therefore a point. Any experience (whether a mental image or an outer perception) has a field more or less wide. Experience is always *Vibhu* or all-extensive, though by practical veiling or ignoring, this *Vibhu* appears to contract into more or less measured fields: and this sort of seeming or pragmatic contraction can even approximate to the other end of the pole, the *Anu* or atomic point which is an ideal limit. [The term "seeming" indicates the Māyāvāda view. According to the Shākta standpoint, there is a real contraction (*Sangkocha*) as manifested Power of an unchangeable Power-holder. This antinomy it does not pretend to solve. This distinction does not affect the matter in hand.] For when a man thinks that he is attending to a point his experience is not really exhausted in that point.

Experience has ever then a field and perhaps an unmeasured field though this is practically ignored. By "field" is not meant an outer field always: it means a mass or tissue of experience which can be analysed into parts. A partless experience would be atomic or *Anu*: but this is an ideal limit only: ordinarily at any rate every experience has parts. An experience may be homogeneous or heterogeneous as regards its constitution.<sup>157</sup> Psychology also attributes extensiveness to sensations.<sup>158</sup> Organic feelings such as headache, heart-palpitation are felt to be less extensive than feelings of general uneasiness such as fatigue, sleepiness, hunger and so forth. Thus extensiveness is a property regarding which sensations and also ideas may be compared with one another.

---

<sup>157</sup> e.g., I am sensing or imaging this white sheet of paper. This is homogeneous experience. It has parts or elements and therefore it is a field. An experience which is a mixture of sounds, colours, and smells, etc., is heterogeneous. This too has parts.

<sup>158</sup> e.g., the roar of distant thunder is felt to be more extensive or voluminous than the screech of a parrot. The palm of the hand placed on the back of another is felt by that other as more extensive than the tip of a finger so placed.

Summarising the above we may say that the ground of all experience is the Ether of Consciousness, or *Chidākāsha* as Vedānta calls the Supreme or Perfect Experience. The Experience itself is felt or intuited as an Universe to which no definite bounds can be set. Within this universe, we seize upon (swayed by pragmatic interests) a definite portion or section<sup>159</sup> and bring it into prominence and veil or ignore the rest, though given. Then we think and talk as though this selected part or section were the whole Fact. Thus I say "I am experiencing a particular pain now," and so on. This section also is a field in the sense explained: it is a definite measured field. This field may tend to contract more or less closely into a point.

Whilst extensiveness belongs to both mind and matter, in the latter case it takes a new form, involving as it does suggestions of muscular effort or rather of tactuo-muscular sensations. Here extensiveness becomes

---

<sup>159</sup> As Professor P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya appropriately calls it, since the Vedāntic name for the Supreme experience or Brahman is the Whole (*Pūrṇa*). It is *Akhanda* that is without sections.

extension. Any mental state has its extensiveness or voluminousness besides intensity and protensity or duration. Its extensiveness is not essentially different from that of a material object, say a block of stone ; the latter only explicitly involves suggestions of tactuo-muscular experience, such as up and down, near and far, right and left, inwards and forwards. *Ā priori* also this ought to follow. *Chidākāsha* is immensity of consciousness or awareness. All forms of existence, whether subjective or objective, are *Chidākāsha* or supreme, infinitely full, and entire Consciousness veiled variously by Māyā-Shakti. (From the Shākta standpoint it is Consciousness as Power veiling itself.) Hence all the products of Māyā can only be carved out of, and must be imbedded in, that Immensity.

And all, whether mind or matter are in essence one, for they are at root varying transformations of the one Power. Both the senses (*Indriya*) and their chief *Manas* on the one side and the subtle matter, which by addition of mass (*Tamoguna*) becomes gross matter, derive from the same principle<sup>160</sup> of apperception

---

<sup>160</sup> So in the Vedāntic scheme both mind and matter are derived from differing aspects of one set of Tanmātras.

or *Ahangkara* which issues from *Buddhi*, as the latter does from the Finitising Principle or root of all things, which considered as a Force, is Prakriti (and as a Personal Power an aspect of the Mother of the universe—Her Infinite Womb). Mind is that Immensity veiled in a way. Matter is also that same Immensity veiled in another way. It is true that mental activity has in some cases to be conceived as being focussed, as converging in a point and diverging from a point. So far as that is true, the Nyāya view of the in-extended *Manas* which is atomic (*Anu*) is also relatively true. But this should not be taken to mean that *Buddhi* and *Manas* are essentially different from Matter and that their contrast is given by non-extension and extension respectively.

It has been supposed that the mind is not in space and that therefore it has neither extension nor motion. Space is regarded as something external to it. *Ākāsha* as Space is not essentially distinct from ultimate Reality or Brahman. The quasi-material Ether (*Bhūtākāsha*) is merely the Ether of Consciousness (*Chidākasha*) veiled in a way. The immensity of the former is the immensity of the latter,

though of course the immensity of Experience or *Chit* is the fuller Immensity (*Pūrṇa*) of the two.<sup>161</sup> Mind then exists, operates and moves in space,<sup>162</sup> a statement which has an important bearing on Yoga, and occultism, such as thought-transference.

### § 7

All Psychology recognises the trinity<sup>163</sup> of Knower or Subject (*Janātā*) Known or Object

<sup>161</sup> See P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya's "Approaches to Truth" and "Patent Wonder". Shangkara in his *Bhāshya* on the *Vedānta Sūtra* Ākāshastallingāt distinguishes of course between the primary (Mukhya) and the secondary sense (Gauna) of Akāsha and says that the Ākāsha of the Sūtra is not Bhūtākāsha but Brahman Itself, but he says that the term in the secondary sense too is applicable to Brahman because the latter is similar to Ākāsha in many essential respects such as immensity (Vibhutva) and the like. Akāsha is thus representative of Brahman, "Khang Brahma" as the mantra runs. In some of the developments of *Navya-Nyāya* (Neo-Logic) too, Ākāsha, Kāla, Dik instead of being regarded as separate entities, are identified in substance with Paramātman or Parameshwara (e.g. by Raghunātha Shiromani).

<sup>162</sup> Even *Nyāya-vaisheshika* which regards the Manas as Anu ascribes Vega or movement to it.

<sup>163</sup> *Tripūti*.

(*Jneya*) and Knowing (*Jnāna*)<sup>164</sup> which is stress or interaction between the two. All these are however sections<sup>165</sup> of Consciousness,<sup>166</sup> so that in perception we have not to deal with foreign matter as commonsense thinks, but it is merely a transaction between one Fact-section and another: between one condition of Consciousness or Experience and another. The first is Consciousness conditioned by Mind (*Antahkarana*); the second is Consciousness conditioned by the material object in relation to which the mind energises or functions: and the third is Consciousness conditioned by the functioning of mind. Consciousness being polarised into "I" (*Aham*) and "this" (*Idam*) there is an interaction between the two. Mind (*Antahkarana*) is with parts<sup>167</sup> and can move in space. Mind is a changing and differentiating thing. Mind is capable of moving from place to place and assuming the

<sup>164</sup> Mātri, Māna, Meya is the gist (*Sangkalitārtha*) of Shakti.

<sup>165</sup> Avachchheda.

<sup>166</sup> Chaitanya.

<sup>167</sup> Sāvayava. Mind is created that is has a beginning. What is created is not partless, for creation is a putting together of parts.

form of the objects of perception.<sup>168</sup> This going out to an object and taking its shape<sup>169</sup> is actual. The mind (I speak of Antahkarana) is a radiant and transparent and light<sup>170</sup> Substance and can travel like a ray of light out through a sense organ. Mind is thus an active force, a form of the general Active Power or Shakti.<sup>171</sup> As the brain, the organ of mind, is enclosed in an organic envelope, solid and in appearance closed, the imagination has a tendency to picture it as being isolated from the exterior world, though in truth it is in constant contact with it through a subtle and constant exchange of secret activities.<sup>172</sup> These exist as unconscious psychological phenomena some of which rise to the level of

<sup>168</sup> Artha, Vishaya.

<sup>169</sup> Vishayākārakārita. See Brihad.-Up., 4-3-7; Shvetāshvatara, 3-18; Katha-Up., 2-21.

<sup>170</sup> Taijasa.

<sup>171</sup> Every modification (Vritti) of the root Natural Principle is active and moving, just as its source is. There is nothing static in nature. The mind in particular is always undergoing conscious or unconscious modification (Vritti).

<sup>172</sup> See La réalité du monde sensible par Jean Jaurés cited in Emile Boirac "La Psychologie Inconnue".

consciousness.<sup>173</sup> The mind is not according to Indian ideas (as it has been sometimes regarded in the West) something, static, passive, and merely receptive. It takes an active part in perception both by reason of its activity and the nature of that activity as caused by its latent tendencies (*Sangskāras*). Cerebral activity further takes place not only in the mind itself, but radiates into space beyond the limits of the human organism where it makes for itself a sphere of action. This activity may display itself either in perception, the matter with which we are here directly concerned, or in such occult phenomena as thought-transference, magnetism, healing and so forth.<sup>174</sup> Here the mind not merely *knows*, but particularly through the faculty of will generates a motor force upon exterior objects. Consciousness (*Chit*) is everything :<sup>175</sup> but it

---

<sup>173</sup> Leibnitz appears to be the first in the West to formulate the conception of such phenomena or as he called them "insensible perceptions".

<sup>174</sup> Here we may instance a form of initiation (*Diksha*) to which I have referred in "Serpent Power" (A. Avalon).

<sup>175</sup> Sarvam khalvidam Brahma "All is Brahman" and the Brahma-Svarūpa is Chit. The form is Shakti or Power of Chit or rather Chit as Power.

has been veiled in the universe. It is revealed in those things in which mind is, or to which it goes out and which it illuminates. Because Mind is the revealer of Consciousness it is the highest manifestation, in varying degrees, of the nature of the Supreme Power. Consciousness is eternally self-manifest. It is reflected however only by that which is capable of such reflection, just as the sun is reflected by a mirror. The Mind is thus a refiner of the veil,<sup>176</sup> which enables man to manifest consciousness in varying degree until by Yoga and elimination of mind, passage is made into Mindless Consciousness.

The following well known passage from *Vedānta-paribhāshā* gives an account of perception. "As water from a tank may flow through a channel into a plot of land and assume its shape (square, triangular or any other form) so the radiant mind (*Taijasa Antahkarana*) goes out through the eye or any other sense organ to the place where an object is and becomes transformed into the

---

<sup>176</sup> In Buddhi Sattva predominates and in Vedānta it is derived from the Sāttvikāṅsha of the Tanmātras.

shape of that object. This modification of the *Antahkarana*-stuff is called *Vritti*.<sup>177</sup> Such going out is subject to certain conditions. The object must be *Yogya*, that is must satisfy certain conditions in order that it may at all draw out the *Antahkarana* to itself.

On this and in this connection Professor P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya observes : " Western psychology gives us a one-sided view of Perception : an external stimulus acting upon a sense organ (e.g., an ether-wave acting on the retina). The more vital side of the picture is however given by the above account quoted : the mind goes out as a radiant energy and takes the shape of the object. In the Vedānta view the stress is laid on this side of the affair, though the object's part is also recognised in the stipulation of *Yogyatā*. (For the

---

<sup>177</sup> The movement (*Sancharana*) and going out ("lelayate bahih") does not apply to Chit which never goes, but to an inner stuff, which though ordinarily connected with, and dwelling within, the gross body, can extend and contract and go out and take the shape of objects. In ordinary experience the connection with the body is maintained. In Yoga the body may be left altogether and entry made into another body. There is also an occult power or Siddhi of producing a projection of the self, known as *Chhāyā-purusha*.

mind does not go out everywhere and always but only certain conditions are fulfilled, among which we may suppose the tapping on the nerves by objective stimulation, the action on the body, to be one, the mind's *Sangskāra* or predisposition or interest in a given perception to be another, and there may be other subtler conditions.) Thus the Vedānta view would appear to be a fuller view of the matter than the commonly accepted psychology of perception in the West. The 'jump' from the neurosis to the psychosis is a pretty long jump and an inexplicable one in Western psychology. The affair is explained only up to the stimulation of the *Annamayakosha* (the peripheral organs and the brain); but there is no suspicion of the really important steps in the process, viz., the re-action of the *Antahkarana* and the *Prāna* (vital principle) on the *Tāmasika* (veiling) crust of the object. Really object=subject=the interaction=Consciousness differently encrusted or veiled. The *Antahkarana* is believed to be a stuff that being *Sāttvika* (Consciousness-revealing) and *Taijasa* (radian) can go out and invade the *Tāmasika* (veiling) crust of consciousness in

the form of object (*Vishaya-chaitanya*), envelop and infuse it by its own luminosity (somewhat like the X rays which are themselves ordinarily invisible, but make opaque things transparent) and thereby discover the essential identity between itself and the object : *it is the finding out of this essential identity between Consciousness as Knower (*Pramātri-chaitanya*) and Consciousness as the Known (*Vishaya-chaitanya*) and that between Consciousness as Knowing (*Pramāna-chaitanya*) and Consciousness as object (*Vishaya-chaitanya*) which makes the substance of Perception according to Vedānta."*

(In terms of Shākta doctrine *Mātri*, *Māna*, *Meya* or Knower, Knowing, Known are the gist (*Sangkalitārtha*) of the term Shakti. It is these three which are referred to in the triplication of the Supreme Point or Bindu in which Consciousness commences to contract and thus subjectify itself as the Knower of objects.)

In perception there is a feeling of *directness* or *immediatedness*. This feeling of directness<sup>178</sup> is and can be the import of *Chit* or

<sup>178</sup> Aparokshatva.

Consciousness or Brahman only. Thus in any direct apprehension of objects we are really face to face with Consciousness or Brahman Itself.<sup>179</sup> All differences (*Bheda*) are so many barriers set up by the magic of the veil which is Shakti as *Māyā*: in each act of perception a barrier is momentarily removed so that the underlying and essential unity is recognised. As Professor P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya well says "*Perception is thus an act of owning*: the self owning another which it has disowned in practice (*vyavahāra*)". As however he is careful to point out, this act of owning or identifying in common perception is rather a confused sort of recognition, not possessing the clear import of such ownings as "*Tat tvam asi*" (That thou art) "*Ahang Brahma*" (I am Brahman), *So'ham* (He I am) or as the Shāktas also say *Sā'ham* (She I am). It is a kind of unconscious owning in actual fact, philosophically recognised by reflection, but actually realised by the supreme experience of identity to which these sayings refer.

---

<sup>179</sup> i.e., each perception is a Brahmasākshātkāra or realisation of Brahman in a way.

Immediacy or intuition or direct cognition<sup>180</sup> (*Sākshātkāra*) may relate to two aspects of perception, viz., the Knower, or to the object or the Known. How then is the sensation-complex or *Vritti* intuited? A sensation is a state of the *Antahkarana*: how then do we become directly aware of it?<sup>181</sup>

The conditions of a direct perception or intuition of a sensation-complex or *Vritti* are (a) the *Vritti* must be *Yogya* (must satisfy the conditions), for every *Vritti* of the *Antahkarana* is not that; (b) the object must also be *Yogya* in relation to its appropriate sense-organ in order that the particular sensation may be cognised; (c) there must be occupation of the same position in space<sup>182</sup> by the *Vritti* and the object; (d) lastly *Vartamānatā* or the object being present actually at the moment of the *Vritti* is another condition of direct cognition. Otherwise there is only recollection or anticipation. The Mind-Ray goes out to where the object is, envelopes it, takes its likeness and this objective

<sup>180</sup> P. N. Mukhyopādhyāya.

<sup>181</sup> this is Jnāna-gata-pratyaksha.

<sup>182</sup> Sāmānādhikaranya.

double constituted of Mind-stuff (*Antahkarana*) is the *Vritti*. Thus when a jar is seen, the double or *vritti* must also be projected and localised there: without such projection and localisation there is no sense perception; though there may be recollection or imagination. Such projection and localisation are also recognised by Western Psychology, but then it does not say that this going out and taking the shape of the object is actual. By actual going out, enveloping and so forth the essential identity between subject and object is recognised which is the essence of perception. Western Psychology leaves this essence of perception unexplained.

On this it is to be observed that *Antahkarana Vrittis* may be unconscious or rather subconscious. This corresponds to unconscious ideation or unconscious mental modification of some schools of Western Psychology. To engage the *Antahkarana* and to be in it is not therefore the same thing as being cognised. The revealing power of the *Antahkarana* has its degrees. The *Antahkarana* of an ordinary man can reveal matters, whether things or processes, only within certain narrow limits;

but by *Sādhanā*<sup>183</sup> these limits can be more and more widened and this process is called *Sattva-shuddhi*. Thus *Yogyatā* or competency in (a) and (b) is relative to the state of purification of *Antahkarana*. The ordinary experiencer does not cognise directly (though he can roughly infer) the *Sangskaras* or tendencies laid in the *Antahkarana*, but it is claimed that a Yогin can, and when he does he remembers his past and future cycles of birth. Again a colour-sensation for example of a certain requisite degree of intensity, duration and remoteness only rises into consciousness. We are blind to sensations (they are sensations in so far as they are modifications of *Chitta* or *Antahkarana* and not of the cerebral tissues only) lying beyond our normal limits of sensational intensity. But in clairvoyance and Yoga these subliminal sensations may be known. Referring to the third condition, it is necessary that the *Antahkarana* should go out to where the object is, envelop, and pervade it with its own innate transparency and thus establish the

---

<sup>183</sup> Process by which the result desired (Siddhi) is attained.

equation between itself<sup>184</sup> and the object.<sup>185</sup> When the *Antahkarana* does not go out to the object and establish the equation there is inference, but no direct cognition. This process may be compared with what Western Psychology describes as a localisation of sensation. "Occupying the same position in space"<sup>186</sup> is laid down as an essential condition.

There are rules also for the direct perception (*Pratyaksha*) of the object itself as distinguished from the mental state in relation, dealt with as above. It may be premised that Vedānta, though maintaining the essential unity (everything is *Chit*) of perceiver, perception, and perceived (the object in itself or the thing in itself as Kant would say),<sup>187</sup> yet distinguishes them from each other on account of their separate *Upādhis* or veilings. They are thus the same and yet are not the same. They are the same in so far as they are ultimately Shiva

<sup>184</sup> *Antahkarana-vrittyavachchhinna-chaitanya.*

<sup>185</sup> *Vishayāvachchhinna-chaitanya.*

<sup>186</sup> *Ekatrāvasthānam.*

<sup>187</sup> A Bauddha or modern sensationist would regard a thing as nothing but "a cluster of sensations" localised and objectified. Vedānta does not subscribe to this. See my "Reality".

or *Chit*, and they are the same in so far as they are also the one Power or Substance-Energy which is *Shakti*. But as manifestations thereof they vary. Vedānta is not agnosticism because the thing as it is (not of course fully) is directly intuited by us: we do not simply know the *appearance* of a thing: we get at the underlying Reality which is *Chit* and which is the same as in us. It is however agnosticism in relation to the nature and working of *Māyā*.

The conditions under which the object itself is intuited are (*a*) the equation between *Antahkarana* itself and not merely its modification (*Vritti*) and the object must be shown: that is the latter must be known as possessing an existence<sup>188</sup> not essentially distinct from that of the subject.<sup>189</sup> For this it is necessary that there should be a *Vritti* in the subject or *Antahkarana* resembling the object: for this going out to the object is necessary; (*b*) the object must be *Yogya* or fit for the subject's intuition as before.

In plain language: when I see a jar and know that I directly perceive it, I must first

<sup>188</sup> *Sattā*.

<sup>189</sup> *Pramātri*.

have the object exciting through the physical<sup>190</sup> and vital<sup>191</sup> sheaths the *Antahkarana* (which is the mental sheath),<sup>192</sup> which then goes out to it. The *Antahkarana* temporarily removes, so to say, the gross (*Tāmasika*) crust or veil of the jar and thus brings out the essential unity between the consciousness "imprisoned" in that inert "other". It is thus the knowing (as perception and not in the Yoga sense) of the equation between self and other. In Consciousness (*Chidrūpini Shakti*) there is a veiling which is Consciousness-Power which again is *Māyā Shakti* in association with *Chit-Shakti*. This veiling ranges from the slightest to the heaviest, according to the predominance of the Factors of Power. The former is Mind at its highest, that is consciousness lightly veiled: the former is gross matter in which Consciousness is most veiled. Outgoing activity here slows down and becomes, so far as any further advance is concerned, a static crust. At each end and

<sup>190</sup> Annamaya-kosha.

<sup>191</sup> Prānamaya-kosha.

<sup>192</sup> That is the two sheaths Manomaya and Vijnānamaya.

throughout there is the same Consciousness (*Chit-Shakti*) and Substance—Energy (*Māyā-Shakti*)—the one Mother of worship. But as we proceed from Buddhi to gross sensible matter through the various faculties and senses, *Sattva* or the Factor of Power as the Illuminator becomes less, and *Tamas* the Factor of Power as the Veiler becomes predominant. The wholly veiled object is presented to the less and less veiled senses, *Manas*, *Ahangkāra* and *Buddhi*, when the Self which is in the form of *Buddhi* recognises itself in fact, though it is not consciously affirmed in the form of object. Cognition is then a kind of *recognition*, the self knowing its self-form. Ecstatic knowing (*Samādhi*) or spiritual knowing in Yoga is the experience by the formless Self of Itself. In the former both Mind and Matter are active. The latter is apparently inert but is only relatively so and is like all living forms a Magazine of Power. Both Mind and Matter are constantly active to affect one another. In 1842 Moser maintained that two bodies of whatever nature constantly imprinted their image one upon the other even when placed

in complete obscurity.<sup>193</sup> For every manifestation of Power is active, Activity being the essential character of *Shakti*, as Rest is of Consciousness of which it is the Power. In fact the whole world is a criss-cross play of mutual influences, a fact the Hindu has long known.

As far back as 1814 before the more general recognition of occult as well as positive sciences to-day, Madame de Staél<sup>194</sup> when speaking of the rapports between metals and planets and the influence of these rapports on human life said "Why not give the experimental method a wider philosophical concept, which would embody the universe in its ensemble and would not turn up its nose to the 'nocturnal' side of nature, while waiting for more light". By occult phenomena we understand not something supernatural, something not related in a regular and constant form to the ensemble of the forces and laws of the universe which is throughout one, but

<sup>193</sup> thus illustrated prints leave their image on glass made visible by the projection of vapour such as the vapour of mercury, iodin, chlorine, etc.

<sup>194</sup> De L'Allemagne.

as obeying one law governing all phenomena. It is in rapport to ourselves and not in themselves that they differ from the ordinary and constant sensorial phenomenon<sup>195</sup>. With these latter we are here concerned. But the obvious or gross (*Sthūla*) and the occult or subtle (*Sūkshma*) or Cryptoidal Phenomena are governed by the same law. It may be said that these views make of mind a material thing. That in a sense is what the Vedānta alleges it to be. The Shiva Sanghita<sup>196</sup> in conformity with the Chhāndogya Shruti says that the finest part<sup>197</sup> of the food eaten goes to build or repair the *Lingadeha* or mental body.<sup>198</sup> Mind however is not material in the gross sense that "Matter" is, but in a finer and quasi-material sense. All is, in this sense, "material" which is not Spirit (*Ātmā*).<sup>199</sup>

<sup>195</sup> Emile Boirac "La Psychologie Inconnue".

<sup>196</sup> V. Patala, 75-77.

<sup>197</sup> Sāratamah angshah.

<sup>198</sup> Tatra sāratamo lingadehasya pariposhakah.

<sup>199</sup> There are no degrees of or in Spirit. Difference exists between things due to their psychic and physical envelope. Brahman is therefore mindless (Amanah). This does not spell, as some have thought, unconsciousness, but freedom of Consciousness from the limitation of Mind.

Spirit does not interact. Mind and Matter which are forms of its Power do so. It is because they are at base the one and same Consciousness-Power that Mind can know Matter.

The one formless Supreme Self (*Shiva-Shakti Tattva*) in which subject and object coalesce in the Knowledge and Love of the formless Self of and for Itself appears, through its power, as the subject-form which has knowledge and ignorance, like and dislike for the object-form, both of such limited forms being aspects, subtile and gross, of the Supreme Self. That Self is known in world-experience in every act of cognition and feeling. The transcendental Self is realised in the ecstasy of Yoga (*Samādhi*) when the Self "stands away from" its limited vehicles of Mind and Body. This is the Experience-Whole of infinitely rich content. All other experience is of sections of that Whole. The experience of the Supreme I is "I am this universe". The limited I identifies himself with a particular mind and body in it. To the Yogi the whole world is his body and therefore there is nothing outside him as in the case of those who experience through mind and body. This

knowledge is bondage. They who surpass and are freed of it are mindless. But man must first use his mind. It is said “thinking of that which is nameless the stage is reached which is called Shākta”<sup>200</sup>: that is the inner state of which Matter and Mind are the outward expression.

The Vedānta does not teach any intuitionism which discards intellect. On the contrary the Upanishad says (Br.-Up., iv. 5), “the self must be seen, heard, thought upon and deeply pondered. *Ātmā vā are drashtavyah, shrotavyo, mantavyo, nidhidhyāsitavyah*”. It is not by discarding any part of the limited self that the Full Self is known, but by the development of the limited self in every part *and as a whole* into the Whole.

### § 8

All theory should suggest a practice whereby that which the former declares of value may be achieved through the latter. As I have elsewhere said the Indian quest is practical. Philosophising is not done because

---

<sup>200</sup> Shiva-Sūtra-Vimarshini, X.

of mere intellectual curiosity but as part of a disciplinary system (*Sādhanā*) enjoined for realisation by the limited self of its own unlimited and essential nature. That nature has its intellectual aspect and is expressed as Reason. For what is irrational cannot be spiritually true.

From what has been stated it has been seen that Man's essential nature enjoys perfect experience. For It is the Whole which is unlimited Being (*Sat*), unconditioned Consciousness (*Chit*), and perfect and unbroken Bliss (*Akhanda Ānanda*). Mind and Body are an expression of its Divine Power whereby Consciousness is finitised in the individual centres. It is the essential characteristic of Power as such (*Shakti*) to negate or veil infinite being and infinite experience so that it becomes finite being and finite experience.<sup>201</sup> But the negation or veiling exists in degree. It is much less in the case of Mind than in that of Matter, which to the limited experiencer is that which is other than and apart

---

<sup>201</sup> So it is said "Negation is the function of Power" in Yogamunis Commentary on Abhinava Gupta's *Paramārthassāra* (Nishedha-Vyāpāra-rupā Shaktih)—a very profound saying.

from the experiencing subject. Again in the case of Mind the degree of veiling of Consciousness varies. There is no Matter in which Mind is not present, though patent or latent in varying degrees. This follows from the scheme of the involutionary principles (*Tattva*) from *Buddhi* downwards, and the doctrine that the effect is the cause modified. From *Buddhi* the first psychical principle *Ahangkāra* is derived ; that is *Buddhi* remains what it is as cause and is transformed into *Ahangkāra* as effect.<sup>202</sup> *Ahangkāra* or *Asmitā* is the individualising and therefore centre-making principle. From it is derived subtle matter and from the latter gross matter. Therefore all matter is individualised or is a Self, in which the psychical principles from which it is evolved lie veiled. An atom of Hydrogen is a Self and a Man is a Self, though the latter is, and the former is not, a developed Self with fully realised Self-Consciousness. In the effect there is the cause and therefore in gross visible matter (*Bhūta*) there is that

---

<sup>202</sup> This doctrine is explained by the simile of "light from light". A second torch takes light from the first which yet remains itself undiminished.

from which it is produced, viz., subtle matter and the I-making principle (*Ahangkāra*) from which the latter is derived. In *Ahangkāra* again there is *Buddhi*. Mind however is so hidden and undeveloped in inorganic matter that its only expression is an extremely rudimentary response to stimuli made apparent by scientific experiment, such as those, now well known, of the distinguished Indian Scientist Sir Jagadish Bose. Yet even here it may be that one kind of "non-living" Matter may be more responsive than another.

All Matter as everything else is composed of the three factors (*Guna*) of the Natural Principle (*Prakriti*) which is the source of both Mind and Matter. All Matter has then *Sattvaguna* in it, that is a Principle which reflects or manifests Consciousness. Differences however exist between the various kinds of Matter "non-living" and "living" as regards the degree to which the *Sattva* or manifestation of Consciousness is veiled by *Tamas Guna*, or that factor in Being which obscures Consciousness by suppressing the *Sattva* which manifests it. The first stage of evolution or liberation of Consciousness is the

organisation of Matter by the vital Principle (*Prāna*). As explained in my volume on Life, *Prāna* is a guiding, directing, and, to such extent, intelligent principle which organises Matter into living forms with increasing degree of freedom and greater and greater display of Consciousness. There is Consciousness in the lowest living forms, but there it is greatly veiled by that aspect of Power (*Shakti*) which is the specifically veiling principle (*Tamas Guna*). During the course of evolution, Mind which has been always present, however latent, is more and more developed until we arrive at the higher animals, the earliest primitive Men and then Man as he exists to-day.

The process is the *development* of Mind and *release* of Consciousness under the influence of what has been called the Vital Impulse, itself unexplained. According to the Shākta doctrine however, this evolutionary impulse is one form of the eternally recurrent rhythm which is observed in (amongst other things) breathing, namely an outgoing and indrawing breath. So in the Macrocosm, Being of its nature (*Svabhāva*) goes forth (*Srishti*) as Power involving

itself in Mind and Matter, and then evolves itself out of Mind and Matter, and again involves itself in a process which is Eternal. This is the throb of the Heart of Power (*Shakti*) who is called the Heart of the Supreme Lord.<sup>203</sup> As this process involves all dualities and therefore suffering, those who are liberation-seekers (*Mumukshu*) strive to free themselves by various methods, some negative and others positive. The mass of men ignorant and careless are satisfied to enjoy the world and to take risks of suffering so unevenly distributed. With the former we are here concerned.

Mindlessness (*Unmani Shakti*) that is experience unconditioned by Mind, and therefore Being in all its infinite freedom and fulness is the aim and end. Mind, owing to the predominance of *Sattva Guna*, reveals Consciousness more than Matter does : for the latter is dominated by the Veiling Factor of Nature (*Tamas-guna*). But Mind reveals Consciousness by degrees, some minds more than the rest. The purer the mind the more it reflects or manifests (whatever simile we apply) Consciousness. The object then of the self-realising

---

<sup>203</sup> Hridayam parameshituh.

discipline or Sādhanā is to purify the Mind so that it may manifest Consciousness. Purity of Mind is therefore to be sought. "Pure" and "Purity" are not used in their sexual sense only. This is only one and an elementary form of purity. It is obvious that if a Mind is dominated by sensuous desires and images it cannot reflect or show Spirit. For this reason the Tantras in specifying the qualifications of the proposed disciple exclude the lewd (*Kāmuka*) and the glutton. It must be pure also in respect of other matters, and therefore free of greed, anger, envy and all else which is the mark of the impure Mind. Such a Mind is incapable of understanding spiritual things. But the Mind must not only be pure in the sense of freedom from what is bad, but must be positively kind and good and free from error. Purification of Mind is called *Chittashuddhi*. The Mind must be an efficient and trained instrument of knowledge. The Mind should be keen for, and fed with such, knowledge which is its appropriate food, and should if necessary be sharpened by the study of logic and the practice of debate. It should be made capable in this and other ways of understanding

the highest metaphysical ideas. And so the disciple is recommended to study the sacred texts, Logic, and Metaphysic. At the same time there should be devotion to and worship of God as the Mother-Power (one with Shiva as unchanging Consciousness) who is called Lalitā, Mahākālī, Mahātripurasundarī, Mahākundalinī and by other names which denote only aspects of the one Reality as Power.

Ritual is the art of religion. The rituals are designed to secure realisation of Unity with Her. *Shākta Sādhanā* which term includes what is called in English "ritual," is based on sound psychological principles with which I will deal in another volume. The ritual is an expression in action of the philosophical principles above described. Thus the whole evolving cosmic process is imagined in the rite called *Bhūtashuddhi*, in which each of the lower principles is merged in the higher, until in imagination the abode of *Shiva-Shakti* is reached.<sup>204</sup> So also the *Shrī Yantra* or

---

<sup>204</sup> So Prithivi is dissolved in *Aप*, *Aप* in *Agni* and so on in the special centres or *chakras*; in *Sādhanā* imaginatively, in *Yoga* actually.

Diagram represents both the body of the Sādhaka as the Microcosm and the whole universe.<sup>205</sup> All ordinary acts and functions become worship by dedication to the Mother-Power, and self-identification with that Power in all physical functions and acts. The *Sādhaka* then realises himself as the Mother Power in the form of himself.

A type of the worshipper's self-dedication is given in the Mahānirvāna Tantra (VI. 178—181).<sup>206</sup>

“Om—Whatever ere this I have done through the Mind, Vital Airs and Body, whether when awake, or in dream, or dreamless sleep, whether by mind, word or deed, whether by my hands, feet, belly or organ of generation, whatsoever I have thought or said—of all that I make an offering to Brahman. I and all that is mine I lay at the lotus feet of the Ādya Kāli Om Tat Sat.” After saying this, dedication

<sup>205</sup> See my Introduction to Tantrarāja, Vol. VIII, Tantrik Texts: also my translation of the Kāma-kalāvilāsa which deals with the Shri Yantra.

<sup>206</sup> See A. Avalon's Translation “Tantra of the Great Liberation”.

<sup>207</sup> Om. That (Brahman) Being or Reality (Sat).

is made of the Self.<sup>208</sup> The instructed worshipper knows that the self is dedicated to the Self, and that the Self, in the person of the worshipper, has thought, said and done all that is offered.<sup>209</sup> The unity of the self and Self is well brought out in the Mantra which is said over the elements in the circle of worship : “The act of offering is Brahman. The offering itself is Brahman. Into the fire which is Brahman offering is made by him who is Brahman. By him alone who is absorbed in the offering to Brahman is unity with Brahman attained<sup>300</sup>.

Not only must the Mind be purified, but care must be taken as regards what is offered to it. The Mind, as such, is never without an object. Care is therefore taken in the ritual to supply it with a good and

<sup>208</sup> Ātma-samarpanam. This is a vilomārghya or offering of the Self as Arghya at the feet of the Devī.

<sup>209</sup> Thus when the Shākta Vira takes the Consecrated Wine, he offers it to the Mother residing in himself in Serpent form in the Mūlādhāra Centre at the root of the Spinal Column. But how does She drink it? By and through him who is a representative (*Pratika*) of Her.

<sup>300</sup> Mahānirvāna, VIII, v. 215.

divine object. As already stated the Mind goes out and shapes itself into what it knows. Therefore a divine object is presented to the Mind, so that it may shape itself into that. The Mind is, in its essential Nature, Consciousness. Mind as Mind obscures it. Endeavour is made by *Sādhana*, or worship and discipline, to lessen this obscurity by purification of the Mind as an obscuring force. *Sādhanā* is external and internal or mental (*Mānasa*). When Mind is purified so as to manifest in high degree Consciousness, then the *Sādhaka* enters *Yoga* by the practice of which the Mind so increasingly reflects Consciousness that it disappears as the stars of the midnight sky in the blazing light of the sun at midday.<sup>211</sup> If it be asked how this is possible, the answer from the worshippers standpoint is that all is possible by the co-operation of the individual and supreme Self. By worship there comes what is called the "Descent of Power" (*Shaktipāta*) or Grace (*Anugraha*) which strengthens the individual

---

<sup>211</sup> One of the questions is—does it, as limited centre remain in fact, even if it disappears to view. According to some it does, the saying being "Like a bird in the forest".

effort.<sup>212</sup> In monistic Yoga the Self works without an other. In both cases the Self is working and because it is the Self which works, and because that in which it works or its vehicles is a form of the Self, it is capable of modifying and transforming them. For the result of all successful *Sādhanā* and *Yoga* is transformation. From the *Sādhaka's* or worshipper's, standpoint there is worshipper, worship and worshipped. From the Yoga standpoint the transaction is wholly between the Self and the Self and none other. The result (*Siddhi*) which is the attainment of the Experience-Whole (*Pūrṇa*) is gained by the use of all men's faculties of knowing (*Jñāna*) feeling or devotion (*Bhakti*) and good disinterested action (*Karma*). In each case one or other of these operate in greater or less degree. All lead to the same end.<sup>213</sup> But men are of differing temperament and their faculties vary in power. Some men will be

<sup>212</sup> In the same way the *Sādhanā-shakti* of the worshipper is strengthened by the *Mantra-shakti* or power of the *Mantra* which he practises in *Mantra-sādhanā*.

<sup>213</sup> And so it is said that there is no difference between Supreme Devotion (*Parābhakti*) and *Jñāna*.

drawn to the path of action, others to that of devotion and those whose intellect is highly developed may follow the path of knowledge or religious philosophising (*Jnāna Yoga*). But whether it be one or another, the One Consciousness is at work through the will of the individual to transcend the limitations of the Mind, at length passing from the highest state of mental experience (*Samāni Shakti*) <sup>214</sup> to that of *Unmani Shakti* <sup>215</sup> which is Mindless or full unlimited Experience, unrestricted by the limiting forces of Mind. This is *Chit* or Pure Consciousness—the Kutastha Shiva which is full, pure and Perfect Experience.

---

<sup>214</sup> These terms mean “with Mind” and “without Mind” and are two aspects of Consciousness-Power. See A. Avalon’s “Serpent Power” and “Garland of Letters”.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*

Printed by J. R. Aria at the Vasanta Press, Adyar, Madras.

TANTRIK TEXTS  
UNDER GENERAL EDITORSHIP OF  
ARTHUR AVALON

---

Rs. A.

<b>Vol. I. Tantrabhidhana with Bija-Nighantu and Mudrâ-Nighantu.</b> —A Tantrik Dictionary. Edited by Târanâtha Vidyâratna with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ...	2 0
<b>Vol. II. Shatchakranirupana.</b> —A work on the six centres of the body by Pûrnânanda Svâmi, with Commentary of Shangkara. <i>Pâdukâpanchaka</i> —(“Five-fold footstool of the Guru”), with commentary of Kâlîcharana and Notes from the Tîkâ of Vishvanâtha on the Second Patala of Kaivalya Kâlikâ Tantra; with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ... ... ...	2 0
<b>Vol. III. Prapanchasara Tantra.</b> —Edited by Târanâtha Vidyâratna, with an Introduc- tion in English by Arthur Avalon ...	3 0
<b>Vol. IV. Kulachudamani Nigama.</b> —Edited by Girisha Chandra Vedântatîrtha. With an Introduction by Akshaya Kumâra Maitra	2 0
<b>Vol. V. Kularnava Tantra.</b> —Edited by Târanâtha Vidyâratna, with Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ...	3 0

Rs. A.

<b>Vol. VI. Kalivilasa Tantra.</b> Edited by Pârvati Charana Tarkatîrtha with English Introduction by Arthur Avalon	...	2	0
<b>Vol. VII. Shrichakrasambhara.</b> A Buddhist Tantra, edited by Kazi Dausamdup with a foreword on the Vajrayâna by Arthur Avalon	...	...	...
<b>Vol. VIII. First Part. Tantraraja (<i>Kidimata</i>).</b> Edited by Mahâmahopâdhyâya Lakshmana Shâstri Drâvida	...	...	3
The Second Part of same is in preparation.			
<b>Vol. IX. Karpuradi Stotra</b> (Hymn to Kali Edited with Commentary by Vimalânanda Svâmi with complete translation by A. Avalon	...	5	0
<b>Vol. X. Kamakalavilasa,</b> a work of the Kashmir School by Punyânanda with Commentary by Natanânandanâtha. Edited by Mahâmahopâdhyâya Sadâshiva Misra, with a full translation in English by A. Avalon	...	5	0
<b>Vol. XI. Advaitabhvopanishad, Kalyupanishad, Tarepanishad, Kaulopanishad.</b> Edited by Sitarâma Shâstri with, Introduction by Arthur Avalon	...	3	0

### WORK BY ARTHUR AVALON

#### ON TANTRA SHASTRA

<b>Tantra of the Great Liberation. (<i>Mahâ-nirvâna Tantra</i>.)</b> A Translation from the Sanskrit, with Introduction and Commentary by Arthur Avalon. <i>Out of print. Reprinting</i>	8	0
--	---	---

Rs. A.

<b>Hymns to the Goddess.</b> From the Tantra and other Shâstra and the Stotra of Shang- karâchâryya. With Introduction and Com- mentary. Translated from the Sanskrit by Arthur and Ellen Avalon	... ...	3 0
<b>Principles of Tantra.</b> Part I. The Tan- tratattva of Shrîyukta Shiva Chandra Vidyârnava Bhattachârya Mahodaya. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by Arthur Avalon	... ...	8 0
<b>Do.</b> <b>do.</b> Part II. With an Introduction by Shrîyukta Barada Kânta Majumdar. Edited by Arthur Avalon	... ...	12 0
<b>"Wave of Bliss"</b> ( <i>Anandalahari</i> ) a trans- lation and Commentary by Arthur Avalon. <i>Out of print</i>	... ... ...	1 8
<b>"Greatness of Shiva"</b> ( <i>Mahimnastava of</i> <i>Pushpadânta</i> a translation and commentary by Arthur Avalon together with Sanskrit commentary of Jagannâtha Chakravartti. <i>Out of print</i>	... ... ...	1 8
<b>The Serpent Power.</b> ( <i>Kundalini Yoga</i> )	... 15	12

### BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

**Shakti and Shakta.** Essays and addresses  
on the Shakta Tantra Shastra. Second Edition

7 8

**Garland of Letters.** Reprinting.

*To be had of*

LUZAC & Co., LONDON

THACKER SPINK & Co., CALCUTTA

GANESH & Co., MADRAS

TARaporewala & SONS, BOMBAY

"For the student of religions there is then a mine opened for his enquiries. The whole work bears the stamp of conscientiousness and accuracy.—*Literarishches Zentralblatt fur Deutschland.*

"The first impression was of amazement and delight. The Mahanirvana is one of the most important of Hindu philosophical works combined with elaborate ritualism and its translation therefore by an European involved certainly a prodigious amount of study, sympathy and real understanding. Of the Introduction alone it may be said that for its lucidity, conciseness, directness and for its depth of penetration and insight it may itself claim to be a standard work on the much abused Tantras. We have rarely come across such an illuminating exposition of the Principles of Devi Worship." (*Prabuddha Bharata.*)

"Most meritorious productions. From what has been said it is clear that Avalon is right when he declares that up to now this literature has been too often judged and more often condemned without knowing it and that the Tantras deserve to become better known than has been the case hitherto."—*Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* (Professor Dr. M. Winternitz).

"Arthur Avalon has rendered an eminent service to the Cause of Sanskrit Literature."—*Calcutta Review* (*Mahamahopadhyaya Satish Chandra Vidya-bhushana*).

"We suspect that Arthur Avalon is one of the learned Pandits of Bengal whose native speech has not been without influence upon his almost impeccable English. We value highly the work done, if for no other reason than it gives us a real insight into the jargon of the ritual and the worthlessness of Tantrik Philosophy." *The Nation* (New York).

" Illuminating discussion ("Serpent Power"). Author makes some rarely fine brilliant definitions . . . throughout maintains a strictly scientific attitude though he is obviously impressed with the extraordinary nature of the Tantrik Doctrine."

*Britain and India.*

" There is no doubt that he has an extensive and peculiar knowledge of the subject of which he treats." - *Luzacs Oriental List (Dr. Barnett).*

" The first fact which strikes the student of Eastern Philosophy is the Author's extraordinary knowledge and the second is his impartiality." (*Shakti and Shakta*). *New India.*

## BOOKS BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

	Rs. A.
<b>BHARATA SHAKTI</b> 3rd Edition (Addresses on Indian Culture) ... 1 8	
<b>IS INDIA CIVILIZED?</b> 2nd Edition ... 2 8	
<b>SEED OF RACE</b> ... 1 0	
<b>SHAKTI AND SHAKTA</b> 2nd Edition (Essays and Addresses in the Tantra Shastra) ... 7 8	
<b>THE GARLAND OF LETTERS</b> (Studies in the Mantra Shastra) <i>Nearly ready</i>	
<b>THE WORLD AS POWER</b> A series of volumes on Reality, Life, Mind, Matter, Conscious- ness ( <i>the last three in preparation</i> ).	

## IS INDIA CIVILIZED?

### PRESS OPINIONS

"Foreign domination has been much more than mainly political. It is the cultural and social conquest of India which is the really important one, insidious in the cause but permanent in its results. Alien culture threatens to obscure the soul of India, to swamp the Indian culture. Therefore Sir John Woodroffe's latest book is most opportune. His style is simple and convincing. The fundamental principles of Indian culture are examined with great power of insight. Sir John's purpose is to defend the minds of young India against defilement—to create a strong working faith in their own ideals and for this India will be very grateful."—*The Commonweal (M.S.M.)*.

"Powerful exposition of Indian culture . . . Many wise political, social and religious observations abound in its inspiring pages. We can commend its perusal to all who are seekers after the truth. If it serves to induce the Europeans to abate some of their racial pride, prejudice and intolerance, and the Indians to have a more correct appreciation of their culture, then it must be regarded as a most opportune publication at the present moment when the great catastrophe in the West has shaken the faith in the basic principles of Western culture and has given a powerful stimulus to the spirit of introspection and enquiry."—*The Leader*.

"Deep insight into what is of true value in Indian culture—clear with an enthusiasm all the more effective because restrained. It is his conception of India that is the great inspiration in the book. His conception of life is Indian through and through. I have read this book all one afternoon marking page

after page its trenchant criticism of our detractors, its pen pictures of Indian life and culture and especially its illuminating description of what some of our philosophies really mean. It is as if once again as of old, one heard an ancient Guru talking to his disciples. It is a noble book for every Indian home."—*New India* (*C. Jinarajadasa*).

"Sir John has already earned an abiding place in the affections of our countrymen by his intimate and profound studies of Hinduism and his enthusiastic exposition of the basis of Hindu culture. The volume in spite of the ephemeral nature of the incidents of composition has a permanent value and must find a place in the library of every self-respecting Indian."—*Central Hindu College Magazine*, *The monthly organ of Benares Hindu University*.

"This matter and much more are explained with wonderful lucidity. Sir John points out that the true view of human evolution is the Eastern one and supports and illustrates his position by reference to, and also using the clear-cut and meaningful nomenclature of that system of Hindu Philosophy and Religion of which he is such a master."—*The Hindu* (*Dr. Subramanya Aiyar*).

"So ably indicates the basic principles of Indian civilization and repudiates the baseless charges with such commendable enthusiasm and righteous indignation as could have befitted one who by birth has inherited the culture—deserves study by every sincere believer in Indian thought. An admirable book—crushing reply—from start to finish shows that the author has a masterly and sympathetic grasp of the whole situation and he who goes through it will find himself in touch with the essentials of Indian Civilization."—*Prabuddha Bharata*.

"Sir John Woodroffe has done well to expose the fallacies underlying certain old time attacks recently reiterated—is deeply imbued with the spirit of Shakta Vedantism, and it is from this point of view that he defends Indian Civilization. In a very fine chapter Sir John Woodroffe exhibits the various opinions held about India and her civilization."—*Servant of India* (Professor R. D. Ranade).

"Contains high intellectual qualities with freedom from prejudice or nonsense of any kind—the best informed work on the subject written by one not a Hindu."—*United India and Native States*.

"The book demands the close attention of every Indian who is interested in the future of his country. It is an urgent invitation to us to appreciate better both this sacred trust and the near peril which besets it, and to stand firm and faithful in the hour of ordeal. The author develops his theory with great skill and much quiet depth and the essays are strewn throughout with acute and penetrating observations expressed with a lucid solidity which tempts one constantly to quotation."—*Arya* (Aurobindho Ghose.)

"Is throughout thought-provoking and replete with interesting passages. But those on whom Sir John's eulogisms will drop like manna from Heaven should also ponder on what (else) he has to say. It would be well for India if instead of cultivating a blind racial vanity, for which Sir John's book will furnish ample material to the unthinking bigot, we concentrate our attention on those other lessons preached by him, for only by so doing we would make a right use of the truths it contains."—*Modern Review*.

"This noble work is a trumpet call to the Indians to realise their greatness and distinctiveness and to build the great future of India—a loving and

intimate student of a great culture." — *Hindu Message*.

" India owes a deep debt of gratitude to Sir John Woodroffe for this timely volume in defence of Indian culture—certain social aspects have been so satisfactorily discussed and defended by this erudite defender of our civilization that if the Indian social reformer would care to read and think over them, much of his rancour towards orthodoxy will prove baseless. India's greatest civilization is misunderstood by many intellectual imps both foreign and indigenous. It is a consolation to find that great minds, Indian or foreign, can realise it so well as in the case of Sir John's. Knowledge of the inner capability of the Ego teaches but one kind of patriotism which is of course universal and not national. It is as silly to hug the degenerates of our own nationality as to hate the great souls of the other continents. But to stand for their rights when oppressed is the privilege of every right thinking man and words fail us in thanking Sir John for his humane duty; may they be ever more." — *Mahratta*.

" Sir John writes profoundly of the Hindu religion and culture of which he is an ardent admirer and his defence of Indian Civilization is informed with a glowing enthusiasm. He finds it easy to confound the rationalist Mr. Archer. The book will not please every Christian that reads it. But no occidental student of Indian politics should miss the reading, for it explains much in the Hindu character and point of view that before was obscure and incomprehensible. The Author believes that the ancient Hindu culture which has persisted throughout the ages, is the best for India and he is fearful lest it be lost in the political maelstrom which will follow the war." — *Capital*.

**Great erudition—sturdy champion of Sanâtana Dharma.**—*Indian Daily News.*

“Most effective and crushing rejoinder—the work of a distinguished scholar and deep thinker—truly merits a very wide circulation in this country. It is a profoundly philosophic study of the subject.”—*Hindusthan Review.*

“The constitution of a politically dependent people can never appear to advantage because it is the interest of the politically dominant people to discredit everything belonging to the subject race as inferior. The Author has been actuated by a strict regard for truth and a desire for the establishment of true Dharma. He has not spared from criticism what is mean, calculating, vulgar, inhuman in his own countrymen, nor has he minced words in condemning what is low or servile or selfish or imitative in Indians of to-day. Actuated by the highest aims, he has really given a most remarkable and convincing book on a difficult and much-abused theme.”—*Bombay Chronicle.*

“Ably written defence of Hindu civilization by a profound scholar . . . It would have been better if he had entered as much an emphatic protest against the prevailing abuses of Hindu society as he has taken care to define its virtues and ideals.”—*Everyman's Review.*

“It is rather unusual to find among the British members of the Indian Judiciary an apologist for the claims of the Neo-Hindu revivalists and their allies the Extreme Nationalists. It is in this role that we find Sir John Woodroffe figuring as a sort of modern Saul among the prophets—much of the book is occupied with an unworthy attack on Western and particularly Christian civilization.”—*Madras Mail.*

"From keen irritation and annoyance . . . we passed to a feeling of contempt touched by a sorry sense of amusement that the Absolute (or the Spirit or whatever else the Author wishes to call it) should indulge in the bad joke of this conflict. . . . We consider both Mr. Archer and Sir John Woodroffe in this episode a nuisance. . . . There is an absence of clearness even of logic. . . . A person who presents such a position as this is not really and truly the friend of India."—*The Indian Philosophical Review* (Professor A. Widgery).

"Rechauffe' of more or less familiar arguments—without the illumination of any new thought—vague, obscure—illogical antithesis and loose and disingenuous assertions—extravagant abstraction—cannot be exempted from the charge of bias. His interpretation of the West suggests that with all his metaphysical abstractions he is unable to distinguish form from reality—vapourising, nebulous. The aspect of these essays is when not obscure, familiar; their style is provocative without being very stimulating. The confusion of issues, the multiplication of sketchy extracts without context, the breach of simple rules of logic and a running speech that gives no reason for the division into Chapters make altogether a book which is very hard to read and still harder to remember when read."—*Englishman*.

"Sir John Woodroffe is a guide whom the reader may follow with confidence. He has lived many years in India and has shown himself to be in real sympathy with the spirit of the East; on the other hand he has not lost touch with the ideals of his own people, nor been blinded by the essential beauty of Indian tradition so as to be unaware of actual present defects; nor does he forget that those who write against or in praise of India must do so with exactness, discrimination, and the latter with

the avoidance of mere puffing general statements. He is definite and balanced and gives one the impression of being thoroughly reliable." - *Theosophist* (*A. de L.*).

"I admire the spirit of absolute fairness with which Sir John Woodroffe has approached the task which should be studied carefully by every Indian who aspires to lead the people and to mould the aspirations of his countrymen." - *Indian Review* (*Hon. Mr. Justice Seshagiri Aiyar*).

"The whole book is replete with useful suggestions to every one who is interested in a proper understanding of Indian culture—Sir John who has devoted many years to the study of Indian religion and who brings to his task a judicial frame of mind and abundant sympathy has no difficulty in proving the utter hollowness of Mr. Archer's conclusions." -- *Vedanta Keshari*.

"Sir John Woodroffe rightly earned the gratitude of the people by his recent vigorous repudiation of the many unjust aspersions made on India and the Indians by a foreign critic." [Hon. Justice Sir Abdur Rahim in his Convocation Address (1919) to the Mysore University.]

"We have not seen any one who loves Bhârata as Sir John Woodroffe does. His pre-eminence consists in this that he has said that the service (Seva) of Bharata is the service of Shri Bhagavan." *Utsava* (*R.D.M.*).

*By the same Author*

## BHARATA SHAKTI

### COLLECTION OF ADDRESSES ON INDIAN CULTURE

"The thoughtful sayings of an honest foreigner, a true Muni or "Freethinker" as he himself interprets the Hindu terms . . . ought to be in the hands of every Indian. It would give him thought and self respect. The Christian Missionary and the Christian Orientalist are the two great factors of Indian denationalisation. We fight the third factor the politician more or less successfully. We have fought the Missionary and defeated him generally but the scars of his early attacks we are unconsciously bearing as acceptable badges . . . Thus when we run down—we are unwittingly showing ourselves as Chelas of the mediocrity of Europe. Like a living organism we must cast off the foreign matter trying to bore a home into our intellectual system. Sir John does not spare the Indian mind in its analysis. He has very ably shown that our so often professed Vairagya is more often our incapacity and sometimes philosophic confusion. The little book is one of those productions which would go to make a new age in this country. It is a protest against cultural suicide of a civilization designed by its past to live for ever."—*Modern Review.*

"Sir John Woodroffe rarely says anything which has not an element of originality in it. He makes a powerful plea against the cultural conquest of this country by the nations of the West . . . a vigorous plea which we commend to the notice of every

true born Indian. Sir John's sympathy is bold and fearless as his scholarship is deep and erudite—he has a clear and perspective view of our culture."—  
*Amrita Bazar Patrika*.

"The whole of the booklet is studded with shining gems of thought and thrilling insight into truth... this sterling faith in the profound individuality of India, in the glorious future which She is bound to work out for Herself, in the great mission She is to fulfil in the world, animates every word spoken in the addresses compiled in this book. We cannot, in fact, overestimate the necessity of every student of India, of every worker in Her cause, furnishing himself with a copy of this compilation and it is our ardent wish that the great exponent of the wonderful Tantrik lore of India would more often make time to come forward, as in these addresses, to contribute his weighty ideas to the keen intellectual struggle going on in our country round practical problems of re-organising our life and thought."—*Prabuddha Bharata*.

"Each of these papers is overflowing with thoughtfulness and desire to do good to Bharata. We ask every English-educated man to read it. It will give us reverence for our natural culture and will save us from the thoughtless spirit of imitation."

"Politically India is dead. This is bad enough but if cultural conquest follows the political then She will be truly dead. Is India to be a mere name and Her culture assigned the cold room of the Oriental scholar, or is She to be a living form?" Sir John Woodroffe takes up the question with as much enthusiasm as the youngest Nationalist amongst us. His answer is one of courage and hope. . . . but Sir John is not blind to the difficulties."—*Searchlight*.

"Inspiring title he has what is not given to many, understood the soul of India. He is a thorough sympathiser with Indian aspirations and has dwelt upon the real aim and purpose of our efforts. Ought to be read by every patriotic Indian. He will then have a clear vision and feel a new strength in his onward struggle."—*New India.*

---

# THE SEED OF RACE

An Essay on Indian Education.

Price Re. 1

BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE  
OPINIONS

"There is much in this little essay with which the student of India cannot but heartily agree."

*-Asiatic Review.*

"Of immense value . . . what is Sangskara, the Racial soul, the author as one who has dived deep into Indian Philosophy fully discusses in detail . . . this is the right view of Indian Education."—*Searchlight—Patna.*

All who seek knowledge as to the essentials of Indian education should possess and study carefully a copy of this book.—*New India.*

"Readers of 'Is India Civilized' will realise how well qualified the author is to offer an opinion on the maintenance of racial culture. His answer is sufficient to refute the contention of his critics that his love for the old and beautiful in Indian Culture has made his outlook reactionary."—*Theosophist* (A. de L.).

---

PUBLISHED BY GANESH & CO., MADRAS





COMMUNION OF THE HOLY GHOST

LITURGY OF THE HOLY GHOST

THE HOLY TRINITY

